Comment Resolution Log
for
Supplementary Directives (SC4N432)
(QCNO26)

Comment Resolution Log
for
Supplementary Directives (SC4N432)

The resolutions to all issues marked "ACCEPT" have been incorporated into the SC4N537 version of the Supplementary Directives. The following people helped resolve the ballot comments: Phil Kennicott, Greg Paul, and Len Slovensky. They all deserve a tremendous "thank you for a job well done". The initials of the individual who handled each comment are included at the end of the comment. PRK is Phil Kennicott, GAP is Greg Paul, LWS is Len Slovensky, and JDW is Joan Wellington.

GERMANY

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-1
AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)
CLAUSE: 5.7, 5.8
DESCRIPTION: There is not enough guidance on how to construct clause 6, annex C and annex D of an AP document. Especially for clause 6, a statement is missing on how to document the conformance class specific subset of the AIM. Currently, some APs (202,203) provide bullet lists with those AIM entities, that are in scope of a specific conformance class. This still leaves the task up to the implementor to define a subset of the AIM schema using this list. Since this is an error prone process, it is recommended that the AP provides (maybe in an informative, digital annex) one schema for each conformance class. In case the list is preferred, it has to be decided whether a table (maybe landscape) could replace the list in order to save pages.
RESOLUTION: DEFER - This depends on technical information. Because 30 series parts are not out of WG11, the current release of the S.D. can only be published with limited information, Closed - February 18, 1997, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-2
AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)
CLAUSE:
DESCRIPTION: table of contents needs rework (5.6 succeeded by 5.1 by 5.2 by 5.7)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-3
AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)
CLAUSE: 5.2
DESCRIPTION: If one AP uses the same definition of one entity in the short listing as another AP but there is no AIC existing nor intended to be produced, it still makes sense to identify this case. Therefore a boilerplate as normative text is proposed as follows: "The definition of this TYPE/ENTITY is identical to that given in ISO 10303-XXX" If a definition is not 100% identical,

use 'equivalent' instead of 'identical'. A similar case might occur if one AP shares one entity with an AIC but cannot use this AIC as a whole.

RESOLUTION: DEFER - This is reasonable of other APs. But not addressed yet, far reaching impact, much further studies required. Closed - February 18, 1997, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-4

AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)

CLAUSE:

DESCRIPTION: Identification of AICs in the SOURCE column of mapping tables: Up to now it was required to document the correspondence of the AIC titles and schema names with identifiers such as AIC1, AIC2, etc. in a table preceding the Mapping tables. These identifiers are then used in the SOURCE column (see Table 4 in N432). This should be changed, since AICs are available as Normative references in clause 2 of the AP, they should be referenced by part numbers same as IR parts.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, references to AIC1 or AIC2 removed, Completed February 18, 1997, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-5

AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)

CLAUSE:

DESCRIPTION: Fundamental concepts and assumptions in clause 5: AP203 did introduce a clause Fundamental concepts and assumptions, which includes on one hand a repetition of the scope statement (which is redundant and should be deleted) and on the otherhand information concerning recommended practices (how to instantiate the AIM ..) Since AP214 got a CD comment that such a clause is missing, there is guidance needed - whether this is mandatory / optional / not needed - what the contents should be.

RESOLUTION: DEFER - good issue will incorporate in next version. March 14, 1997, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-6

AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)

CLAUSE:

DESCRIPTION: Font size of sub headings in clause 4.2.x (attributes of Application objects) Currently, these headings have the same font size as the Application objects themselves. There are a lot of user (reader) complaints that it is very hard to differentiate between a clause of an application object and one of its attributes. Therefore we propose to decrease the font size of the attribute headings.

RESOLUTION: REJECT & DEFER This issue has been presented to ISO in Geneva with no concessions on their part.. The subclauses shall have the larger font (14 pt) until ISO says otherwise. - December 6, 1996, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-7

AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)

CLAUSE:

DESCRIPTION: There is an implicit convention that, for clause 4.2, Application objects are

documented starting with uppercase letter ('Circle') and the concepts are documented starting with a lowercase letter (e.g. 'circle'). Since this applies to all APs and is necessary to understand the difference between the two notations, it is proposed to provide a boilerplate in the Supp. Dirs. in order to have this explained in all APs. Same is true for clause 5.2 (entity in bold, concept normal font).

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-8

AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)

CLAUSE:

DESCRIPTION: Plural of Application objects: There is no guidance how to document the plural of an Application object (One A is related to 2 or more Bs). Three alternatives have been discussed:

1) use english plural (but what is the plural of 'geometric_relationship_with_transformation' ?)
2) use singular only
3) use another noun and build the plural of this one (...two AO objects)

In the IRs, usually the entity names printed in bold are suffixed with an 's' printed in normal font. Since in clause 4, everything is normal font, it is not possible to use this convention. Therefore alternative 3) is proposed for clause 4. There should also be guidance for clause 5 (similar to clause 4 or similar to the IRs ?)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, clause 8.5.3 supports proposed #3, December 6, 1996

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-9

AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)

CLAUSE:

DESCRIPTION: Documentation of EXPRESS-G ARMs: clause 4.3: The following standard wording was proposed: "Each AO1 has CARDINALITY AO2 object(s) in the role of ATTRIBUTENAME. Each AO2 acts as ATTRIBUTENAME for CARDINALITY AO1 object(s)." Since, in case of the standard inverse cardinality S[0:?], the second sentence does not add value, it is recommended to explain in a boilerplate at the beginning of 4.3 that, in case no inverse cardinality is given, the default cardinality S[0:?] applies. Furthermore the following problem needs to be discussed: If AO1 has a mandatory attribute attr_1 pointing to a SELECT of AO2 and AO3, the clause 4.3 will look like:

4.3.x AO1 to AO2 - Each AO1 has zero or one AO2 objects in the role of attr_1. 4.3.x AO1 to AO3 Each AO1 has zero or one AO3 objects in the role of attr_1.

This implies that the case is allowed where both are zero. (If we document the cardinality 'exactly one', we imply that both are always needed). The proposal is to have a statement at 4.2.x saying that there shall be exactly one object in the role of attr_1 for a particular AO1. A similar problem occurs in case the attribute is an aggregate.

RESOLUTION: REJECT, DEFER, For this version of the S.D. it shall be required to define in clause 4.3 all of the assertions. This issue shall be look at in the next version of the S.D. The

problem with the select type is solved by the wording in the object definition " A01 shall be one of the following: A02 or A03" , December 6, 1996

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-10

AUTHOR: AP214-Team DiK (ap214@dik.maschinenbau.th-darmstadt.de)

CLAUSE: 5.9

DESCRIPTION: Index entries: currently for each AIM entity an index entry for

- the mapping table,

- short listing

- expanded listing (expanded is missing in the example)

- and conformance test purpose is needed

this needs to be refined, e.g., in case of the mapping table, only entries appearing in the AIM element column make sense (if we introduce one index entry for each occurrence in the REFERENCE PATH, we will generate a very long index.) Furthermore it should be stated that AP developers might introduce other index entries, such as references to the ARM EXPRESS-G or AIM EXPRESS-G figure where the corresponding object is displayed.

RESOLUTION: REJECT, The S.D. states o index only the AIM element column of the mapping table, not the reference path. Also the S.D. defines the minimum requirements, if the AP has additional references to the ARM diagrams that is permitted., December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-11

AUTHOR: Besekau, Endres, Groepper, Dr. Kaefer, Wenzel

CLAUSE: 1.2.1, page 3

CLASSIFICATION:

DESCRIPTION: In the text there is a length unit used that is no SI unit: The set of the margins are described in inches (eg. 1").

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Use SI units.

RESOLUTIOM: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-12

AUTHOR: Besekau, Endres, Groepper, Dr. Kaefer, Wenzel

CLAUSE: 1.2.1, page 3

CLASSIFICATION:

DESCRIPTION: The clause is missing indication where headers and footers have to be placed. This placement should describe the space between header or footer to the text body.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-13

AUTHOR: Besekau, Endres, Groepper, Dr. Kaefer, Wenzel

CLAUSE: 1.2.1, page 3

CLASSIFICATION:

DESCRIPTION: The text refers to functions of a specific word processor (i.e. WordPerfect,

SHIFT-F8, 2, 7)
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Help for using programs should be included in annexes or notes.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: In conflict with Issue Number GER N-432-16, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-14
AUTHOR: Besekau, Endres, Groepper, Dr. Kaefer, Wenzel
CLAUSE: 5.5.3, page 78ff.
CLASSIFICATION:
DESCRIPTION: For ARMs documented with EXPRESS only those assertions shall be listed in clause 4.3 of an AP document, that are not specified in EXPRESS.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT: this issue is unclear and needs further explanation. Closed - February 18, 1997, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-15
AUTHOR: Besekau, Endres, Groepper, Dr. Kaefer, Wenzel
CLAUSE: 5.5.3.1, page 79.
CLASSIFICATION:
DESCRIPTION: The example in Figure 2 does not explain anything, especially the distinction between attribute and assertion is definitely obvious in this figure.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT: ARM example and clause 4 example added, see QT-25, December 6, 1996, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-16
AUTHOR: Besekau, Endres, Groepper, Dr. Kaefer, Wenzel
CLAUSE: 1.1., page 2
CLASSIFICATION:
DESCRIPTION: The clause should neither recommend any word processor, because this is done via resolutions, nor ISO TC184 SC4 meetings.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the clause.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: GER N432-17
AUTHOR: Besekau, Endres, Groepper, Dr. Kaefer, Wenzel
CLAUSE: 5.5.1, page 73
CLASSIFICATION:
DESCRIPTION: The rationale for the recommendation for not using nested or hierarchical structures of UoFs should be given.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER, LWS.

UNITED STATES

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-01
US_ISSUE: 1
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: Introduction
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: second paragraph, first and second line: "...the elements that compose the parts..."
PROPOSED SOLUTION: should read "...the elements that are common to all parts..."
RESOLUTION: REJECT: suggested wording changes the meaning, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-02
US_ISSUE: 2
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: Introduction
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: third paragraph - refers to the fact that the ISO directives Part 3 give general
requirements, and that this document is more specific. But it is not made clear whether ISO's
directives document is included completely or partially; and if partially, how do we know what is
missing and must be referred to in ISO directives part 3?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: explain how much of ISO directives Part 3 is included in this document.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: All editors shall have access to and consult ISO Directives Part 3, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-03
US_ISSUE: 3
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: Notes to Editors
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: last sentence - the word "whereever"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: This word is not in my dictionary. I believe it should be "where ever".
Of course, one should check the Oxford English dictionary to be sure one way or the other.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: Correct spelling is "wherever" (one word), JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-04
US_ISSUE: 4
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1 Scope
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The statement of things within the scope of the SD doesn't mention "informative"
elements.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: A note should be placed after "supplementary elements" explaining that
these are sometimes called "informative".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-05
US_ISSUE: 5
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1 Scope
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Table 1, fourth cell of right column - the word "requirements" should appear at end of the line above it. And on the last line, the explanation "*These elements are required for parts of ISO 10303" - this statement has no obvious or apparent significance. We are not preparing parts of any other ISO standard using the SD. Furthermore, there is no such thing as a standard with only the non-asterisked elements, therefore the asterisks do not mean these are elements which are required additionally to what other standards require.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Move the word "requirements" to the previous line. Explain the significance of the statement, or drop it.
RESOLUTION: This should have been submitted as two comments and the commenter should have consulted ISO Directives Part 3 before submitting it. ACCEPT the comment to move the word "requirements". REJECT the rest of the comment for the following reasons (1) editors of other SC4 standards are using the Supplementary Directives for guidance and (2) SC4 does require more elements than ISO does. JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-06
US_ISSUE: 6
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.1
CLASSIFICATION: Major technical
DESCRIPTION: The reference to WordPerfect version 5.1 (DOS) is not acceptable, notwithstanding the statements of our secretariat to the contrary. The relevant SC4 resolutions DO NOT specify this version of WP, and it cannot be arbitrarily specified by any individual without an SC4 resolution to back them up. Finally, WP 5.1 is a bug-ridden word processor which cannot even keep figures in their original order from one editing session to the next. WP should be generically stated. If a version must be supplied for WP, it should also be required to be supplied for LaTeX. And in that case, the latest versions of these word processors should be named, not 5-year old versions.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the specification of version 5.1 from the text.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: Editors who have begun their work in WordPerfect 5.1 are permitted to continue using it. Additional word processors have been added, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-07
US_ISSUE: 7
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The last sentence is unclear. Once in landscape, left and right margins are what used to be top and bottom. Is the reference made to the shorter edges of the paper, or the longer

edges?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Make it clear.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-08
US_ISSUE: 8
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The first note - "Words being defined" is apparently an attempt to reference the phrase "words that are defined" above it. These should match.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Reword the note to begin with "Words that are defined"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-09
US_ISSUE: 9
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The last line - the reader has to go to section 1.3.2 for additional font information.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: All font information should be found in the font section. Please put it there.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-10
US_ISSUE: 10
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.3
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: This entire section needs to be re-written. It is confusing, and not user-friendly. A part editor should be able to look at this section and follow a decision tree that is clearly marked, to find definitely what he is seeking. Instead, he must deal with this:
1) First paragraph describes a page heading that is for every page except for the Scope page, for parts that are not yet IS.
2) Second paragraph modifies the header from the above paragraph if your document is DIS or FDIS, then provides the header for IS parts
3) Third paragraph refers to parts that are not IS and provids an additional fact for their headers
4) Fourth through sixth paragraphs give examples without using the
indentation or fonts normal for the example format in STEP documents, and without stating that these are examples.
5) Seventh paragraph provides an exception to the previous information in the case of the Scope page.
6) Eighth paragraph provides an exception to the seventh paragraph in cases of a part which is

"...not...DIS, FDIS, or IS status...".

This is so complicated that it must be read several times before a best guess of the intent of the author(s) can be ascertained. I had to selectively highlight sections, then ask qualification, and I still got my headers wrong because the instructions are such a muddle. Furthermore, there is a tendency to specify part statuses by what they are not, rather than by what they are. This "negative referencing" is difficult to read.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: This section should clearly provide the reader with a direct and concise set of examples without negative referencing. It should start by providing parameterized examples of all possible headers. Then it should systematically explain for each part status which headers are used where. For example, after having provided the possible headers, this section should have one paragraph each for NWI (if necessary), WD, CD, DIS, FDIS, and

finally IS.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-11

US_ISSUE: 11

AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 1.2.4

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: The second line of the first paragraph is not meaningful. I have many connotations in mind when told that a "clause is similar to a chapter in an ordinary book." For example, I belive that each clause should therefore start on a new page, but that is contradicted by the end of the third paragraph. In fact, clauses are little like chapters in a book.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Drop this line.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-12

US_ISSUE: 12

AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 1.2.4

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: second paragraph - Since "full justification" is meant, then say so. Do not say "should avoid excess space between words", say that it "shall" not be done.When mentioning hyphenation, this suggests that hard hyphens are acceptable. They shouldn't be.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Require "full justification" by saying so. State that words shall have a single space between them as typed. Then state that the word processor may cause the appearance of additional space in order to provide full justification of the text. Then state that "soft hyphens", which you may need to define as hyphens which appear at the discretion of the word processor, shall be used in longer terms at appropriate locations in order to optimize the density of words and minimize the inserted whitespace caused by full text justification.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-13

US_ISSUE: 13

AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: The requirement for new clauses to follow each other without page breaks should be changed. The pagination requirements listed elsewhere in this document would be much easier to follow if the clauses could start on new pages, because minor changes in text would not cascade so far through the document. In addition, new pages for new clauses makes the document much easier to read. Readers expect major new sections to be respected by new pages - they scan the tops of pages for this sort of thing. They do not
scan every line of every page when seeking new sections.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change the SD to require a new page for each new section.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: ISO granted SC4 an exception to its rule that beginning with the page on which the Scope statement appears, text shall be presented without page breaks. It is now permissable to begin a new clause on a new page but not required, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-14
US_ISSUE: 14
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.4.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
Fourth paragraph - "This requirement may be superseded by specific
requirements in clause 3 and clause 4 for EXPRESS entity names." We don't know whether the clause 3 and 4 refer to the Part being edited, or to these SD.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: There should be a very specific reference made to the clause of the SD document where the exceptions are noted. And a summary of those exceptions, e.g. one or two lines, should be included here.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-15
US_ISSUE: 15
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.4.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Sixth paragraph - the number of lines ABOVE the clause and subclause headings is NOT specified.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Specify them.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-16
US_ISSUE: 16
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.2.4.1

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Seventh paragraph doesn't mean anything. I can't even guess what the intent is here.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please delete or rewrite.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-17

US_ISSUE: 17

AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 1.2.4.1

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Note 3 is redundant with paragraph 8 (the line following NOTE 2).

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change paragraph 8 to read "...for numbering of clauses and subclauses. ..."

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-18

US_ISSUE: 18

AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 1.2.4.2

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: What about use of indentation?

PROPOSED SOLUTION: State that paragraphs shall also be unindented.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-19

US_ISSUE: 19

AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 1.3

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: This section does not define its purpose

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a line explaining what preliminary elements are. I know it was explained in the scope section, but users of this document are not going to refer to, or know to refer to, that section.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-20

US_ISSUE: 20

AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 1.3.2

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: first paragraph, third line, says that the contents list will have "...the complete title of all clauses,

subclauses, ...". This is contradicted by the third paragraph.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
rewrite to say "...the complete title of all clauses and the higher-level subclauses, ..."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-21
US_ISSUE: 21
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: This list of requirements for the table of contents lacks an example.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add an example depicting and summarizing this long list of requirements
for the table of contents.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: The Supplementary Directive's Contents serves as an example and the
document so states, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-22
US_ISSUE: 22
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
The third paragraph says that APs have different numbers of subclauses listed in the table of contents
than other parts of ISO 10303. This is arbitrary and capricious.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Don't make an unnecessary exception for AP's. All ISO 10303 parts
should list tables of contents to the same level - here, the third level.
RESOLUTION: DEFER: This requirement comes from the AP developers and should be
harmonized with the AP Guidelines, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-23
US_ISSUE: 23
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The ISO footnote includes some indentation for the fifth and sixth lines. Is this
intentional?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Specify the exact amount of indentation and point it out explicitly,
assuming it is intentional.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-24
US_ISSUE: 24
AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 1.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The Note is confusing. What does "with carriage returns half way across the line of text" mean? Does it mean that carriage returns in a Part are to mimic the carriage returns shown here, or that they were inserted here but shouldn't be put in a real Part?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Be clear.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-25
US_ISSUE: 25
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The third paragraph refers to the "three" that follow it, but there are four.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change three to four
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-26
US_ISSUE: 26
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The line "Complete the Foreword with the following statements covering annexes are required." is nonsensical
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Repair.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-27
US_ISSUE: 27
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The required wording which includes references to the classifications of Parts should have an entry with elipses at its end, just as the list of Parts does above it.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add an ellipses entry
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-28
US_ISSUE: 28
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.3.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The requirement that the foreword "be numbered with roman numerals in

sequence" is ambiguous.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Re-word to explain that page numbers are being referred to, not clause numbers.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-29
US_ISSUE: 29
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.3.3.2 thru 1.3.3.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: These sections should be 1.3.4, 1.3.4.1, and 1.3.4.2 respectively in order to appropriately parallel the numbering of sections 1.3.3 and 1.3.3.1. The introduction is not part of the Foreword.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Renumber the sections.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-30
US_ISSUE: 30
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.4.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The next-to-last line refers to 1.1.3, but there is no such section
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Refer to the correct section, whatever that may be.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-31
US_ISSUE: 31
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.5.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
"payed" should be spelled "paid"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: respell
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-32
US_ISSUE: 32
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.4.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Sixth paragraph second sentence "followed a colon"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "followed by a colon"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-33
US_ISSUE: 33
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.5.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
The definitions in the part being documented are, if I am not mistaken, to be presented in a font size of only 11 point, rather than 14 point, for the sub-sections.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: There should be a note pointing out that although all other titles of subsections in the document are 14 point, these are not.   If the 11-point requirement only applies to APs and not other documents, include a note explaining this exception and referring the reader to wherever else in the
document this fact is mentioned.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-34
US_ISSUE: 34
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.5.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Second line - "This element is normally clause 4." - when isn't it?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Please state when clause 4 is and isn't the "symbols &
abbreviations" section.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-35
US_ISSUE: 35
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.5.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
Second paragraph, last line - "See 3.6.1.2 for the form of this reference" (to ISO/IEC 8824-1).
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
The correct reference is 1.4.3. 3.6.1.2 is not the form of the normative reference, but is instead a means of applying the requirements of 8824-1.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-36
US_ISSUE: 36
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.5.4

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Third paragraph - references to sections which describe the form of a normative annex for the IRs, APs, and AICs are missing here, and instead are listed as the last line of the section, where they will not be found easily.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please add references to the appropriate section numbers in this paragraph, e.g. "...integrated resources (see 3.6.1.2), application interpreted constructs (see 4.5.1.2), and application protocols (see 5.8.1.5)..."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-37
US_ISSUE: 37
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.5.4, 1.6.1, 1.7.2.3, possibly others?
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: I was under the impression that annex letters must skip the letter "I", but no mention is here made thereof.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: If this is a requirement, please list it.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-38
US_ISSUE: 38
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.7.2.5
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: If a figure is only referenced, or first referenced, in a note or example, does it have to meet the same indentation requirements as the note or example? No comment either way is offered. Another way of asking this question is, can a figure be contained within a note?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please state specifically what is allowed in these cases.
RESOLUTION: DEFER: This should be addressed as part of the work on requirements for figures that ISO Directive Part 3, 1997 will require, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-39
US_ISSUE: 39
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.7.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The text states "If a sublause contains more than one note but the notes are not grouped together, they shall be preceded by NOTE <n - and the text." However, NOTES 1 and 2 in section 1 (Scope) of this very same SD document do not follow that requirement.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Be consistent. Change one or the other, or both!
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-40

US_ISSUE: 40
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.7.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Insufficient explanation is provided of the circumstances under which NOTES contained in a clause or subclause are or are not numbered based on previously numbered NOTES. For example, I believe that in every
subsection, when there is more than one note, each note in that section is to be consecutively numbered starting with "1" FOR EACH SECTION. The reader of this section might reasonably surmise that:
1) Notes are consecutively numbered throughout the document cumulatively; or
2) A group of notes following some distance after another group of notes, but still in the same section, should be numbered beginning with "1" again.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "The notes within each subclause shall be separately numbered..." to "The notes within each subclause, if there be more than one, shall be sequentially numbered starting with '1' ...".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-41
US_ISSUE: 41
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.7.3.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: "A separate numbering sequence of Arabic numbers shall be used for the notes in each table and each figure." This conflicts with one practice of placing note numbers throughout two or more of any of the several AP Mapping Tables, and then placing the text of said note at the end of all of the tables. The same number would be used on several different tables yet refer to the same note; and the numbers for several such notes would increment for the group of tables as a whole, not for each table individually.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Explain exactly how to number and place such notes, or refer the reader to a subsection within section 5 for how APs are to make exceptions to this rule.
RESOLUTION: DEFER: This should be addressed by AP developers and harmonized with Mapping Table Guidelines, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-42
US_ISSUE: 42
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.7.5
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Text doesn't say whether footnotes are informative or normative.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please say which.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: 1.7.5 gives this information, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-43
US_ISSUE: 43
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.7.5.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: "The test of the footnote......by a short line that is left justified." What
kind of a line is this? A string of dashes, a string of some other
character? A vertical or a horizontal line? a string of underscores on the same line, a string of
underscores on the line above the first line of footnote text? And how many spaces' or lines' worth
of length?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Be specific
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-44
US_ISSUE: 44
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.7.5.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: There should be a comma between the two example superscript footnote citations.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please add one.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-45
US_ISSUE: 45
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.8.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: NOTE - "The word "part" used by itself refers to a part or..." - Never define a word
by using the word. Stating that a part refers to a part is nonsensical
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Say that this usage of the word "part" refers "to a manufactured object".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-46
US_ISSUE: 46
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.4.3 (I know, out of order)
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Please make clear whether or not a standard which references another standard
shall, should, may, or should not include normative references to standards which that other standard
includes as its normative references. For example, AP 207 normatively references part 45, and part
45 normatively references ISO 1011. Must, may or mustn't AP 207 also normatively reference, for
example, ISO 1011 as well?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please state the conditions under which this would and would not be

required, advisable, or unacceptable.
RESOLUTION: REJECT: A reference to a document references the entire document including its normative references, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-47
US_ISSUE: 47
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.8.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: " - as described in; " - This lacks a reference to a clause, subclause, or annex. Why is it in this list?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add appropriate reference to this list entry, or delete this list entry.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-48
US_ISSUE: 48
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.12
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Note 2, last line implies that all of the hyphens will print if a word is divided by insertion of a soft hyphen.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: re-word to say "In either case, a hyphen will only print if it appears at an automatically inserted line break."
RESOLUTION: This note is deleted in the current version of the S.D., JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-49
US_ISSUE: 49
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.14
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Words in English sentences can be read in two ways. The most common way is to read them by their meaning. A less common way is to read them as words. For example, in this sentence:
"The word 'the' has three letters" The first and third words are read in these two ways respectively. The first occurrence of the word "the" is read by its meaning, which here is as an adjective which accompanies the noun "word". The second occurrence of
the word "the" is as a word; the string of letters which comprises the word "the" is being referred to, not the meaning of the word "the". Whenever we use a word intended to be read as a word, we have to use quotation marks, as I have done above. Without quotation marks, the meaning of a sentence containing such a reference to a word can be ambiguous.

The sixth through eighth paragraphs use quotation marks correctly. But there are twelve occurrences of words or phrases in the second through the fifth paragraphs of this section which should have quotation marks around them, here presented in the order in which they appear: "EXPRESS constructs", "EXPRESS declarations", "elements", "construct", "data are", "data is", "presentation", "representation", "Presentation", "which", "that", and "That".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add quotation marks as required above.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.
ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-50
US_ISSUE: 50
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.13
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The failure to use quotation marks in all appropriate places, noted in my comments against 1.14, has also occurred here. The fourth and sixth paragraphs need quotation marks as follow: "datum", "data", "Textual".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add quotation marks as required above.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-51
US_ISSUE: 51
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.1.5.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
"Use tail remarks (-- text) to annotate..." - An ambiguous and inconsistent way to indicate format. We don't know where, in relation to an EXPRESS declaration, such a remark is to be placed; we don't know whether to use the ellipses as part of the format; we don't know if the word text is a kind of keyword which always follows the hyphens, or whether it is to be replaced with the desired remark text. Up to this point we have used angle brackets to indicate information to be provided by the part editor (see section 1, Scope).
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Be consistent.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-52
US_ISSUE: 52
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 1.13
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:" - textual: Use 'text'. Textual particularly means taken from the Bible;"
- This statement is either not true, or else should not be true, regardless of what the Oxford Dictionary states. The use of "text" as the adjectival form of "text" is an inferior grammatical choice, albeit acceptable. "Textual" is the normal adjectival form of "text". The assertion that biblicality is connoted by this word is specious - it sounds colloquial - and if correct, only implies that the adjectivization of "text" was originally and for a long time only used in the context of examination of biblical texts - not surprising coming from an age when the Bible was considered essentially the only text worthy of deep study. In the information age, recursive references to texts have become overwhelmingly
abundant, and have required the use of the word "textual" so frequently that its use in a biblical context has become comparatively rare; in fact, I argue that its exclusive use with respect to the

Bible is archaic and an an anachronism.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please check to ensure that the latest edition of the Oxford Dictionary's definition of this adjective is indeed both exclusively and primarily biblical in connotation. If it is not, please remove the restriction on the word "textual". If it is, I urge the removal of this restriction anyway, as it is bound to be rapidly supeseded by the simpler and more natural connotation of "text" 's adjectival form.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-53
US_ISSUE: 53
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.1.5.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The text fails to qualify the use of EXPRESS comment markers as being appropriate when EXPRESS declarations appear individually among non-EXPRESS text. One following such a documentation requirement might naturally assume that in the AP annex A, every EXPRESS declaration would need to be individually bracketed thusly. Also, the instructions to place these characters before "the entity keyword..." should all-capitalize the word "entity". Also, the phrase "...shall immediately follow the end_entity; (or other) keyword on the subsequent line." is ambiguous or erroneous for several reasons. First, "end_entity" should be all-capitalized. Second, the sentence implies that as soon as one finds this keyword, (rather than as soon as one has encountered the last line of the EXPRESS declaration), one is to use the open comment marker. Third, the sentence fails to unambigously require the open comment marker to fall on the line which follows this last EXRPESS declaration line; it could easily be construed to appear at the end of the line on which this keyword appears. Finally, the intention behind using such comment markers is not stated. There should be a paragraph that explains how this comment method facilitates the use of the entire document as compilable EXPRESS code. In addition, the failure to require the open comment character at the very beginning of the document, or the close comment character at the very end of the document, needs to be explained away here.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Explain that the use of these brackets is for individual declarations when they appear within text which defines or refers to them. Explain that it is used once, collectively, for

groups of declarations which appear together. Capitalize the references to EXPRESS keywords "ENTITY" and "END_ENTITY" Rewrite the end of this paragraph as ", and an open comment marker ("(*") shall be placed on the line following the final line of the EXPRESS declaration." Add the requested paragraph at the beginning of 2.1.5.2, explaining the reasons for using (and not using) these comment characters as described above.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-54
US_ISSUE: 54
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.1.7

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The example consistently uses the aliasing clause of the declaration, whereas ISO 10303 parts rarely, if ever use such aliases. The example should use mainly non-aliased USE'd and REFERENCE'd entities.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please make the change by removing 2 or 3 of the 4 "AS s#" clauses.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-55
US_ISSUE: 55
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.1.13
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: If "a comment shall precede the statement group...", then why does the example not contain any?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Augment the example with comment lines.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-56
US_ISSUE: 56
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.2.2.6
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: "enumberation"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: "enumeration"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-57
US_ISSUE: 57
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The labeling of local rules allows the use of short english words instead of URn or WRn. For consistency with the overwhelmingly common practice of simply using URn or WRn, I request that the use of short english words as labels should not be mentioned or allowed.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove both occurences of the phrase "Unless an appropriate short English word can be used, "
RESOLUTION: REJECT: the use of an informative name would be an advantage, and the fact that it has not been done in the past is no justification for not using it in the future, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-58
US_ISSUE: 58
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.3.3

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The period at the end of the first sentence should be a colon.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change it.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-59
US_ISSUE: 59
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
The first entry in the list fails to mention schemas which occupy more than one page, although the possiblity is implied.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please mention such cases explicitly. Add a sentence to the end of this bullet: "A schema may occupy more than one page if necessary."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-60
US_ISSUE: 60
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Fifth list entry - is the indented text an example? It does not make sense.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please clarify.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-61
US_ISSUE: 61
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 2.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: List entry 9 - the "D" at the end of REFERENCE and USE is in upper case
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Use lower case.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-62
US_ISSUE: 62
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
The last sentence only mentions "...the proper subclause of clause 1...", whereas clause 2 may also be referenced.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Rewrite to say "...the proper subclause of clauses 1 or 2..."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-63
US_ISSUE: 63
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
last line of first paragraph - "In addition to the wording given..." is incorrect, because the example which follows is to be given INSTEAD of that wording in 1.4.2.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Rewrite to "Instead of the wording given...".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-64
US_ISSUE: 64
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 3.5.6
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
third list entry - it is ambiguous if the "single subclause" is to be a subclause under the "<schema name type definitions" subclause, or is to be combined with it. I believe the latter interpretation is intended.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Reword to clarify.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-65
US_ISSUE: 65
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 3.5.7.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: third list entry - it is ambiguous if the "single subclause" is to be a subclause under the "<schema name entity definitions" subclause, or is to be combined with it. I believe the latter interpretation is intended.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Reword to clarify.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-66
US_ISSUE: 66
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 3.5.7
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: List entry seven, rule c, second sentence - wording inconsistent with the SD

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Rewrite from "Do not use 'must'." to "'Must' shall not be used."

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-67
US_ISSUE: 67
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 3.5.7
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: List entry seven, rule d - not written consistently with correlative 3.5.6 sentence.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Rewrite as "..shall be presented as notes or examples."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-68
US_ISSUE: 68
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 3.5.10
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The example 18 EXPRESS declaration is followed by an example "Formal propositions" section in the same font as the EXPRESS declaration.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Correct the font of the Formal proposition section.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-69
US_ISSUE: 69
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Paragraph 2 first words "A outline"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Should be "An outline"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-70
US_ISSUE: 70
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.5.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: "is comprised of" is not the preferred use of the word "comprise".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Use "is composed of" instead.
RESOLUTION: REJECT - the use of comprise is consistant with the rest of the document, comprise is used several times in S.D. - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-71

US_ISSUE: 71
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.5.2.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: "sentance" in 14th-from-last line
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Replace with "sentence"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-72
US_ISSUE: 72
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.5.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: List entry one - "primary or forward" order has no meaning. What is primary?
What is forward in this context? When my AP went through qualification, I was told to list my
assertions in "natural order", which meant the entity whose EXPRESS declaration contained the
attribute reference to the other entity would be listed first in each relationship subclause.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please define these terms in this context.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT - December 4, 1996, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-73
US_ISSUE: 73
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.5.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: List entry six - requires plural "objects" if cardinality is greater than zero - should
be if cardinality is greater than one.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "zero" to "one".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution plus or the assertion is "zero or one" - December 4,
1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-74
US_ISSUE: 74
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.5.3.1, Figure 2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Figure should show continuity between relationship lines and the circle at the end
of those lines; and the circle at the end of attribute_2's line should be tangent with, and not intersect,
the box for object_b.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Correct the figure.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-75

US_ISSUE: 75
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.5.3.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The first paragraph explains that the distinction between attributes and assertions in EXPRESS ARMs is difficult to initially determine. But the second paragraph, where one naturally expects to find the distinction, does not make one. Also, the second paragraph, second sentence, says "The exception to this may be inverse relationships." But the reader is never told how that exception is made, or when it holds. And documentation of inverse relationships in terms of the following example clause 4 contains no guidance.   Is the point of this subsection to say that attributes which end in the circle at the end of the relationship line (rather than another EXPRESS declaration) need not be defined in section 4.3, whereas otherwise, they do? If so, just say so. Does this mean that this is the distinction between assertions and attributes in EXPRESS? If so, please say so. Of course, all of this is merely academic. There is, in fact no difference in EXPRESS between assertions and attributes. Any belief in such a distinction derives from a residual bias in the mind of someone who first used IDEF1X; or else it derives from a perceived natural dichotomy of attributes, perhaps between those which point at base types and those which don't - or between those that point at other entities and those that don't; etc. Unfortunately, it is not intuitively obvious to all readers just what the dividing distinction is here, and it needs to be spelled out.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Look at this section and rewrite as necessary to explain the distinction between EXPRESS attribute and assertion documentation requirements, if a consistent, meaningful, and useful explanation truly exists.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution, rewrite of paragraph to clarify the meaning - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-76
US_ISSUE: 76
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.5.3.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The existence of this section begs the question, where is the correlative section for IDEF1X? I'd say the same for NIAM, but I don't personally care about that little-used method.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a section about IDEF1X which parallels that for EXPRESS, or make this section about "different modeling methods' effect on documentation"...
RESOLUTION: REJECT - clause 5.5.3 contains meaningful information to write IDEF1X assertions as well as the correct boilerplate text.- December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-77
US_ISSUE: 77
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Second list entry - description forgets mention of the table number, which shall

follow the initial word "Table" in the header of each table.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add it.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS
ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-78
US_ISSUE: 78
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: First list entry - clause title "Mapping table" is incorrect, as there are virtually always multiple tables.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change title to plural form.
RESOLUTION: REJECT, though it is agreed that there will probably going to be more than one mapping table in an AP, there is the likelihood that there may be one. Also this section is describing how to make A (one) mapping table. - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-79
US_ISSUE: 79
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Last list entry - "MAPPPING". Also, sentence is nonsensical.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Spell "MAPPING". Replace "pruned" with "provided".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-80
US_ISSUE: 80
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5
CLASSIFICATION: major technical
DESCRIPTION: There should not be separate documents containing some of the formatting and editing information for AICs, AIMs, and mapping tables, as there are now. All formatting and editing information from the "Guidelines" methods documents dealing with those documents should be pulled into the SD document. It was fine for them to be separate while their content was being passed around and reviewed and revised. Now is the time to incorporate their contents into the SD.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Incorporate formatting and editorial data about all STEP documents into one place - the SD.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution, however there will still be additional documentation to define who to make these items, but it is agreed that all the formatting items
will be moved to the S.D. document. - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-81
US_ISSUE: 81
AUTHOR: Mike Strub

CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Referring to the boilerplate text on the meaning of the brackets, points a and b: The text should not make a general statement as it does, but should, like point c below them, explain the meaning of what is bracketed by this style of bracket.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Append a sentence to the existing text for a) that reads: "enclosed section satisfies one of those   requirements, and is accompanied by an explanation of which requirement it satisfies in column 1." Append a sentence to the existing text for b) that reads: "the enclosed section is traversed under a particular set of circumstances described in a correlative comment in column 1."These sentences aren't necessarily exactly what I would recommend, but at least they address what the contents of the brackets means.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution, A & b rewritten - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-82
US_ISSUE: 82
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.6.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Second paragraph, end of first line: "wirtter"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: replace with "written"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-83
US_ISSUE: 83
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.6.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Figure 4 is redundant with information found in Guidelines for the development of mapping tables. All of this data should be in the SD
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Put it there, take it from other methods document.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, need to send this issue to the N367 mapping table document as well - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-84
US_ISSUE: 84
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.6.2
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: On the page that starts "5.2 AIM EXPRESS short listing", fifth paragraph - the text prescribed to "follow the title of the subclause", it is required that the base definitions of constructs shall be referenced down to the section number. This is an extreme requirement from which we have in the past been excused, needing only to refer to the document, not the sections.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the requirement to reference the sections here.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-85
US_ISSUE: 85
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.7
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: third paragraph "text)as"
PROPOSED SOLUTION:add space: "text) as"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-86
US_ISSUE: 86
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.7
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: 11th block of text is the required text for conformance classes in an AP. it ends
"specified in this class."
PROPOSED SOLUTION: It should end in "specified in that class."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-87
US_ISSUE: 87
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.8.1.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The third line of the prescribed text says "...are likely to implemented..."
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Insert "be" as: "...are likely to be implemented..."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-88
US_ISSUE: 88
AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: 5.9
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: last line - "...include the _uses_ of an ..." - what is this referring to?
And what are the underscores for?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:Clarify.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution -underscores removed- December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-MS-89
US_ISSUE: 89

AUTHOR: Mike Strub
CLAUSE: Annex A
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The cover sheet shall NOT be completed in full. The Comments to Reader section at the bottom is optional. Also, the meaning, requirements, and form of the various sections should be spelled out.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Please spell it out.
RESOLUTION: A new cover sheet and a readme file for completing it have been added, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-PW1
US_ISSUE: 90
AUTHOR: Peter Wilson, NIST
CLAUSE: Clause 1.2.6, top of page 8.
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The instructions for marking subdivisions of a list are typographically horrible and confusing to any reader of a standard that uses the recommendation. The current instructions are unacceptable.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: There are two kinds of lists (as noted in ISO Part 3 --- both 1986 and new draft). One is where items are marked with a dash, the other is where items are marked by a sequential element for identificational purposes. N-432 mixes these as all lists go:
-- first level
a) second level
1) third level

The above comes from a misreading of ISO Part 3. In the new draft the wording is clarified. "Each item in a list shall be preceded by a dash or a bullet or, if necessary for identification, by a lower-case letter followed by a parenthesis. If it is necessary to subdivide further an item in the LATTER (my emphasis) type of list, arabic numerals followed by a parenthesis shall be used.
Two kinds of lists must be acknowledged --- bulleted and `enumerated'. As STEP is more than usually complex, several levels of each kind of list are required.

For a bulleted list, use dash at the first level, solid bullet at the second and star at the third (LaTeX style files have provided this for years).
-- first level
o second level
* third level

For an enumerated list, use loer-case letters, then arabic numerals, then lower-case roman numerals (again as per LaTeX STEP style files).
a) first level
1) second level
i) third level

Note that the first release STEP Parts used the above scheme (see Part 11 as an example).
RESOLUTION: DEFERRED to the next version of the Supplementary Directives that will address the changes required by the new Part 3, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-PW2
US_ISSUE: 91
AUTHOR: Peter Wilson, NIST
CLAUSE: Clause 1.2.2 (and elsewhere)
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: 14 point bold font is unacceptable for table and figure captions. This is the same size and style as clause headings and is visually distracting to the reader as well as giving undue emphasis to the caption. 11 point bold font is acceptable for table and figure captioning.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: As a passing coment, I find it very strange that the size, style and weight of the font used for (sub)clause headings has no relationship to the level of the heading. Normal practice is to reduce the font as the clause levels go more sub so that the reader can tell at what level a clause is from the heading style. In the case of STEP the reader has to read and note the depth of numbering, which requires more effort.
RESOLUTION: REJECT comment on size of table and figure captions. New Part 3 addresses font size for clause and subclause headings, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT1
US_ISSUE: 92
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Annex B
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Annex B should contain an ISSUE LOG template. I believe that SC4 had developed this template along time ago and was modifed by Bill Burkett and PDES,Inc. This template is tfor tracking issues from CD releases forward till IS release.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT2
US_ISSUE: 93
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: TOC pg iv
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: TOC pg iv there are some AP Subclaues titles and numbers that have made it into the TOC, i.e. 5.1 Mappping Table, 5.2 AIM EXPRESS short listing, 6 Conformance requirements. These should be removed
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT3

US_ISSUE: 94
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Introduction page vii
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Replace guidelines with instructions in Introduction page vii and any other approperiate places in the SD. There are specific Guideline Documents that are to provide the detailed guidance of what gets documented.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT4
US_ISSUE: 95
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Page 3 subclause 1.2.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 3 subclause 1.2.2 -11 point......., words that are defined, what does this mean? Are not all words defined? Should it read "words being defined" to support the NOTE- or should it read" terms that require definitions" or should it read " terms that are defined in subclause 3 "other definitions"? Provide an example.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT5
US_ISSUE: 96
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Page 3 subclause 1.2.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 3 subclause 1.2.2 -11 point......., in addition to issue 4 above subclaue heading for AAM (F.1.n) definitions shall be11 pt. (I thought these were requested changes from Geneva?) Provide an example.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT6
US_ISSUE: 97
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Pg 3 subclause 1.2.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Pg 3 subclause 1.2.1 Margin settings mid-paragraph (usually "standard") for ISO should be (usually A4) is to be selected.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPTED, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT7
US_ISSUE: 98
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Page 4 subclause 1.2.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 4 subclause 1.2.3 what is the Headres for JWG-9?? "ISO/IEC"?
Provide an Example.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFERRED: should be addressed in the next version of the Supplementary
Directives, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT8
US_ISSUE: 99
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE:
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 4 subclause 1.2.3 the 1st sentence of last paragraph should be made an
example. But the entire page header should be provided as an example.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT: this is not an example; this is the "real thing", JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT9
US_ISSUE: 100
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Why not include the year in all page headers not just the DIS and beyond?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT10
US_ISSUE: 101
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page headers should not be boldface, according to this SD.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT: S.D. states that page headers are in boldface, JDW

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT11
US_ISSUE: 102
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Page 6 subclause 1.2.4.3

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 6 subclause 1.2.4.3 is an incomplete
definition/discription of Orphans and Widows (O&W). Q&V have an expanded difinition of O&W.
They include also the Clause and Subclause headings, Examples, NOTE-, Table & Figure title, and
EXPRESS delimiters, i.e.*) and (*. Wording from 1.2.4.1 "No clause or subclause heading shall
appear by itself at the bottom of a page."
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTIOM: DEFER: Q&V should provide their expanded definitions for the next version of
the Supplementary Directives, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT12
US_ISSUE: 103
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Page 6 subclause 1.2.4.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 6 subclause 1.2.4.3 1st sentence replace should with shall.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT13
US_ISSUE: 104
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 first paragraph refers to the document 'Guidelines for the development
of the mapping tables'. Should this be found in a Normative reference rather than a bibliography?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT will add to new S.D. clause - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT14
US_ISSUE: 105
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1, page 81
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1, page 81 third item of list: 'When the mapping is to IDENTICAL
MAPPING OR PATH, no source is pruned.' This is no information in the mapping table guidelines
that say this. If source is not pruned then the mapping table guidelines should also indicate the same
information. And if the mapping table guidelines does indicate that source is not pruned it should
expand on what is pruning.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT pruned changed to the word provided. Issue should still be reviewed in
N367 as to what prunning means.   (see MS-79)- December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT15
US_ISSUE: 106
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 81
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 81 last paragraph before boiler text: 'Because of the text contained in this required wording, the format for the list has been varied slightly from the usually required' Reading this sentence makes no sense. Maybe it should read something like: 'Because of the special characters used in the lists in the required wording, the format of the list shall be formatted as a second level list (see 1.2.6)' 21
PROPOSED SOLUTION: 'Because of the special characters used in the lists in the required wording, the format of the list shall be formatted as a second level list (see 1.2.6)'
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 4, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT16
US_ISSUE: 107
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 82
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 82 : The mapping table guidelines section 6.1.6 defines "<>". for enclosed sections in a reference path. Add this symbol to the list.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT definition added   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT17
US_ISSUE: 108
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 82:
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 82: The mapping table guidelines section 6.1.8 defines "‖" for enclosed supertypes in a reference path. Add this symbol to the list.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT: definition added   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT18
US_ISSUE: 109
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 82
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 82, list item k: '\: the line continuations for strings that wrap.' This item is not defined in the mapping table guidelines.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT: this issue has been issued against the NN367 mapping table document

- December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT19
US_ISSUE: 110
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 84
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 84, mapping table example. This is an example of ho to do a mapping table so use the S.D. format for it: table is landscape, header and page number are in portrait.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: header and page number are in portrait.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT20
US_ISSUE: 111
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General issue
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: General issue that Supplementary Directives needs sections for: Normative references, Definitions, Abbreviations.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT21
US_ISSUE: 112
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Annex B
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Annex B: If the Supplementary Directives are to become a 'standing document' then the reverences in the Bibliography to Guidelines for AIC development, Guidelines for the development and approval of application protocols, Guidelines for the development of mapping tables, and Guidelines for the development of abstract test suites should be removed and placed in the Normative Reference section of this document.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT22
US_ISSUE: 113
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: clause 4, page 63
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 4, page 63: The 'Guidelines for AIC Development" should go in a Normative Reference.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT. JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT23

US_ISSUE: 114

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: clause 4, page 64

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: clause 4, page 64: Table 2 is not a table, it is an outline and should be defined as an outline. If a table is ready required then use the S.D. clause 1.7.1 format. Tables shall be bordered.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT24

US_ISSUE: 115

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: There are no guidelines for the structure of the index of the AIC document. What should it look like and what thing should go in the index ?

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT25

US_ISSUE: 116

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: Clause 5.7, page 88

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Clause 5.7, page 88:

This section documents the contents of AP clause 6 conformance requirements and gives a boiler plate text that gets added. However every AP I have reviewed has a conformance class table that mappes all the AIM elements to the various conformance classes. Ther is also a list of the various classes. The format of this list and the table are not defined and should be.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT more information has been added to show the format of the conformance table. But there should be no list of confromance classes. There shall be a seperate subclause for each class along with description as stated in this section of the S.D.   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT26

US_ISSUE: 117

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: There needs to be a decision made on the requirements of the AAM diagrams. Should they follow the FIPS or can they be allowed to deviatefrom the FIPS standard (modified).
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER: This should be discussed with AP developers and resolution incorporated in new version of the S.D., JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT27
US_ISSUE: 118
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: need to include prose that describes the placement of the footers with respect to the page #s
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT28
US_ISSUE: 119
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: pg 89&90 annex B
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: pg 89&90 annex B title conflict.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT29
US_ISSUE: 120
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: 5.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Each shall have an Abberviation subclause 3.n
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT figure changed to include '3.n Abbreviations" - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT30
US_ISSUE: 121
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: 5.8.2.1.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: 5.8.2.1.1 remove the reference to abbreviations.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT31

US_ISSUE: 122

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: 5.8.2.2

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Add to the AAM 5.8.2.2 (Annex F)the capalitity to subdivide: ACTIVITIES, ICOM, and specific groups of activity Add boilerplate text for these subclauses with examples of what is permitted (KOBE discussion)

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: DEFER - This will be a part of the next version of the S.D., Closed February 18, 1997, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT32

US_ISSUE: 123

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: page 60 & 92

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Font size conflict see page 60 & 92. There is no font size specified for the (normative) or (informative).

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT33

US_ISSUE: 124

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: 1.6.1.1

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: 1.6.1.1 Bibliography need examples of how to reference things like FIPS, National Standard, Standing Documents, Technical Reports, and other documents that have no authers.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: REJECT, bibliographies are to be based on ISO 690. Editors should get a copy, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT34

US_ISSUE: 125

AUTHOR: Qualification Team

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Conflict between the WHERE RULES labels in the Short form and the Expanded listing. SD shall state which is correct or the STEP 10303 Parts. Currently the short form is upper case but the expanded form are lowercase. Q&V question the inconsistency.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER: some changes were made to this version. Q&V should review and include further changes in next version of the S.D., JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT35
US_ISSUE: 126
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: page 46
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: MAJOR CONFLICT occuring in APs see page 46 needs to
specifically state those what is included in the Express-G diagrams. Refer to the TIGER team required list. Currently not all IRs and APs are consistent. What is AnnexG exceptions refering to?? All APs have been going to the simple strings ie LABEL, TEXT, etc.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER to AP developers, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT36
US_ISSUE: 127
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: need for where to place the activity number with the title of the activity. ie before the ":" or after? This only applies when the activities are separtated from the ICOMs.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RFESOLUTION: DEFER to AP developers, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT37
US_ISSUE: 128
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Annex-F see 5.88.2.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Modify the boilerplate text for Annex-F see 5.88.2.1 to reflect the current text found AP213 & AP202 as follows:

The application activity model (AAM) is provided to aid in understanding the scope and information requirements defined in this application protocol (part of ISO 10303?). The model is presented as a set of definitions of the activities and the data and a set of activity digrams. The diagrams use a modified IDEFO notation [3]. Figure F.1 gives the basic notation. Each activity may be decomposed to provide more detail. If an activity has been decomposed, a seperate diagram is included.

As with any IDEF0 model, the application activity model is dependent on a particular viewpoint and purpose. The viewpoint of the application activity model is that of the designer who has responsiblity for documenting the product.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER to AP developers, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT38
US_ISSUE: 129
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: 5.8.1.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Modify the boilerplate text stated in 5.8.1.2 to read as follows: The application activity model is given figures F.2 through F.5. Activities and data flows that are out of scope are marked with asterisks.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT39
US_ISSUE: 130
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Guidance is required for the size of the "*" in the diagrams in F.2 of the AP. If 8pt is used the * appears as a round dot. There has been a wide range of sizes submitted to Q&V.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT40
US_ISSUE: 131
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Pg 93 5.8.2.1.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Pg 93 5.8.2.1.1 refers to 1.5.1 however 1.5.1 contains boilerpalte text and format information Q&V request these be seperated and restated.
RESOLUTION: Agree, definiton changed. Changed February 18, 1997 LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT41
US_ISSUE: 132
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: ISSUE for mapping Table. The requirement for the use of "#" in the AO and AIM elemnets shall be explicitly defined. AS to when it is to be used and when it is NOT to be used.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER: mapping table developers should address this comment, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT42
US_ISSUE: 133
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Pg 66 5.7
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Pg 66 5.7 needs to include boilerplate for a single conformance Class with no options.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT boiler plate text added   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT43
US_ISSUE: 134
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: pg 76
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: pg 76 boilerplate text 4.2 Application objects with the reference to <title of the AP there should be a note to the developers that the title of the AP should be lowercase in the boilerplate.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT44
US_ISSUE: 135
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Pg 26 1.7.2.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Pg 26 1.7.2.1 the requirement that at least 40% of the available space on the page be covered should be removed or reduced. This requirement has could the use of excess white space of the page.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER: this should be part of the discussion about figure requirements that will be needed before the next Version of the S.D is issued, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT45
US_ISSUE: 136
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: there needs to be note stating that all of the diagrams for each of the following shall be of the same scale for each set in the annex. ie AAM, ARM, AIM. Reference also AAM, ARM, and AIM clauses.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: DEFER to AP developers to create wording for a note, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT46
US_ISSUE: 137
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Pg 76
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Pg 76 the existence dependent on a subtype (IDEF1x complete categorization) is the ABSTRACT Supertype with a ONEOF. this should be add too the SD.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT: do not understand the comment, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT47
US_ISSUE: 138
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Pg 33 1.12
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Pg 33 1.12 include X-axis as an example for axis callout.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT: what is the issue?, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT48
US_ISSUE: 139
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: pg 26 and 27 1.7.2.2 and 1.7.2.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: CONFLICT pg 26 and 27 1.7.2.2 and 1.7.2.4 one place 2 blank line are called out and the other is 1 blank line.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT49
US_ISSUE: 140
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: there needs to guideline provided for the use of quotes marks in WordPerfect or and other word processors. What is the character to be used.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT50
US_ISSUE: 141

AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Genral
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: JLC ACTION discuss with Nigel andor Joan the prose for optionals in the assertion definitions. see AP202 and AP224 may be exactly one vs. zero or one. Discussions from the AP developers requeseted the zero or one it fits style of zero, one or many. SD SHALL be specific as to which is to be used by the AP developers. Q&V recommends that may have <cardinality Application Object and that zero or one be used for optionals.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER to Q&V, JDW.
ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-QT51
US_ISSUE: 142
AUTHOR: Qualification Team
CLAUSE: Pg 22, pg 60, pg 67, pg 92
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Pg 22, pg 60, pg 67, pg 92 the Information object registration lack specific information on version(n) and the method for documenting the schema for IRs, APs, and AICs. Currently very confusing for the developers of each. AIC and AP have a single schema only and do not XXXXX_schema. Also the version (n) used for CD, DIS,FDIS,and IS shoild be clearly stated in the SD.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: Accept for AP page 92. Change made February 18, 1997- LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-01
US_ISSUE: 143
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: Table of Contents page ii
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: One cannot find the instructions for preparing the Introduction in the table of contents (because of the 3 level numbering).
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT: Quality Committee requirement to follow ISO style makes it impossible to include Introduction, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-02
US_ISSUE: 144
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: List of Tables page v
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The entry for 'Table A.1' should not appear in the list of Tables.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-03
US_ISSUE: 145

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1 page 1
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The material in this Clause is more than Scope.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Separate into two parts with only the material through Note 2. Place the general formatting information in a new clause.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT: reformatting of document takes care of this, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-04
US_ISSUE: 146
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE:
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: Add clauses for normative references and definitions. Include at least the word 'normative' in the definitions.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-05
US_ISSUE: 147
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1 page 1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The second note requires a 'NOTE' caption; the caption for the first note should be 'NOTE,' not 'NOTES.'
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-06
US_ISSUE: 148
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.1 page 2
CLASSIFICATION: major technical
DESCRIPTION: The restriction of WordPerfect to 5.1 (DOS) ignores the fact that many documents have been prepared with 5.1 for Windows, and 5.1 for Windows has incompatibilities with respect to 5.1 (DOS). These documents cannot be prepared with 5.1 (DOS).
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-07
US_ISSUE: 149
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.2.1 page 3
CLASSIFICATION: major technical
DESCRIPTION: As I understand the requirement, the same source should produce the same pagination, regardless of the selection of A4 or A stock. It is not clear that the instructions accomplish this. In any case, it should be made clear what the requirement is.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-08
US_ISSUE: 150
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.2.2 '3;
bullet starting "10 and 8 point Times..." CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Add a comma after 'respectively.' PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-09
US_ISSUE: 151
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.2.2 '3; note
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: This appears to be a requirement, not information. Remove it from the NOTE
context.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-10
US_ISSUE: 152
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 1.2.3 page 4; paragraph starting "The header for part 1 of ISO 10303..." (paragraph
number and page number)
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: This paragraph, together with the following two appear to be examples and should
be labeled as such.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-11
US_ISSUE: 153
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 1.2.3 page 5; paragraph starting "For the page on which the
Scope..." (paragraph number and page number)
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: This paragraph should not be the last paragraph in the
subclause. Place it earlier.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT: need previous information about the headers earlier in preparation of a
part of ISO 10303, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-12
US_ISSUE: 154
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.2.4 page 5

CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: The term 'subclause' is ambiguous with respect to the level of its text in the clause hierarchy. This point should be made clear here.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-13
US_ISSUE: 155
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.2.6 page 7
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: While it is clear that appropriate punctuation is to appear after the final item in a list, it is less clear whether a conjunction should appear after the next to final item. The documents appear both ways. (Examples are the lists in this subclause and the list on Page 12.)
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify.
RESOLUTION: DEFER, while both ways are permissable, one method should be chosen and used throughout the next version of the S.D., JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-14
US_ISSUE: 156
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.2.6 page 9;
Paragraph starting "Each entry shall be followed..." number and page number)
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The term 'full stop' appears to be used more often in the document. Change to read "...semicolon (preferred) or a full stop (period)...".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-15
US_ISSUE: 157
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.3.3 page 11
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: All of the boilerplate text used in the documents should be available on SOLIS, not just the list of parts.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT, all boilerplate text is available. The editor only needs to download a copy of the S.D. The titles file is maintained separately because it changes after each SC4 meeting - more often than a new version of the S.D. is produced, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-16
US_ISSUE: 158
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 1.3.3 page 12; Paragraph starting "Complete the Foreword with the following" (paragraph number and page number)

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Change "...statements covering annexes are required" to "...statements covering annexes as required".

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-17

US_ISSUE: 159

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.3.3.4 page 14; first boilerplate

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: There appears to be an extraneous set of angle brackets toward the end of this text.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-18

US_ISSUE: 160

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.3.3.4 page 14; last two paragraphs CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: There is confusion here. The first (starting "This part of ISO 10303 specifies...") appears redundant with respect to the second (starting "This application protocol defines..."). The text in the angle brackets of the first paragraph appears to require a new (third) paragraph.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: DEFER to AP developers, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-19

US_ISSUE: 161

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories

CLAUSE: 1.4.3 page 18; paragraph starting "When referencing other standards..." (paragraph number and page number)

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: The word 'should' in the first sentence should be changed to 'shall.'

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-20

US_ISSUE: 162

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.4.3 '18

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: The four standards of this document should be moved to my proposed 'Normative standards' clause.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: AGREE, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-21
US_ISSUE: 163
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.5.1 page 19; first paragraph
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: This paragraph needs to be split. The first part, describing the clause and the fact that each term is to go in a subclause is appropriate. The material about the form of a definition applies to more than this clause. I suggest this material appear in a separate paragraph on page 20 following the paragraph starting "The subclause number for each term...". Text should be included saying that this structure for a definition applies throughout the document being prepared, not only to the Definitions clause.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT the concept, (the comment itself was difficult to understand), JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-22
US_ISSUE: 164
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.5.4 page 21
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The material describing the information object identifier should appear in a separate subclause, preferably at the end of 1.5.4.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-23
US_ISSUE: 165
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.5.4.1 page 22
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: In the model, the words 'Title of annex <N' will confuse some people. The inclusion of '<N' implies that this it to be the literal title. I suggest "title of annex." This comment also applies to 1.6.1.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-24
US_ISSUE: 166
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 1.6.1.1 page 24; paragraph starting "References to this annex in the rest..." (paragraph number and page number)
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: This paragraph needs attention. The second sentence says (in part) "The purpose...shall be of the form [n]... I doubt this is the intention. Consider an example.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-25
US_ISSUE: 167
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 1.7;.1.2.4 page 25
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The instructions about case in titles omits the possibility of proper nouns appearing. I suggest a general paragraph earlier in the document about capitalization in titles.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT: this information is already there, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-26
US_ISSUE: 168
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.7.2.1 page 26
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Nothing is said about borders for figures. PROPOSED PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: DEFER: the subject of figures, their formats, font specifications including point sizes, etc. should be addressed in the next version of the S.D., JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-27
US_ISSUE: 169
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.7.2.1 page
26; first sentence CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Change
"...shall be line drawings or text or a combination..." to "...shall be line drawings, text, or a combination...".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-28
US_ISSUE: 170
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.7.2.2 page 26
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: This clause has many 'shoulds.' I think at least the last (regarding the appearance of a figure in the middle of a paragraph) should be 'shall.'
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-29
US_ISSUE: 171
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.7.3 page 27
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Change the words in parentheses from "unless they are notes within a table or a figure" to "unless they are notes within a normative table or figure".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT. JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-30
US_ISSUE: 172
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.7.3.2 page 28
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The term 'subclause' is ambiguous with respect to nesting. This fact makes the statement that "...notes within each subclause shall be separately numbered..." useless.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: State the nesting level intended.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT. JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-31
US_ISSUE: 173
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.7.5.2 page 29
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The word 'part' is used where 'document' would be more
appropriate.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT, wording changed to "part of ISO 10303", JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-32
US_ISSUE: 174
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.8.1 page 29
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: The 'shoulds' in this subclause should be reviewed for change to 'shall.'
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT:, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-33
US_ISSUE: 175
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.8.2 page 30
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: An informative reference to an International Standard requires the date of publication. It is unclear what is required for an informative reference to a CD, DIS, or FDIS.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-34
US_ISSUE: 176
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.8.3 page 30; bullet starting

"As described in..."
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: Complete it.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-35
US_ISSUE: 177
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.10.5 page 33
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Change 'should' to 'shall' (two places).
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.
ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-36
US_ISSUE: 178
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.12 page 33; note 1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: There are requirements here which should not appear in a note. Change 'should' to 'shall.'
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, Note deleted, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-37
US_ISSUE: 179
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 1.12 page 33; paragraph starting "Where the hyphenation"
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Change "...hyphenation of a name is required..." to
"...hyphenation of an EXPRESS name is required...".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-38
US_ISSUE: 180
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.12 page 34; note 2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Change "...combination control-hyphen will insert a hyphen following..." to
"...combination control-hyphen will insert a potential hyphen following...".
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: Statement deleted, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-39
US_ISSUE: 181

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.13 page 34; first paragraph
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: I doubt that 'DOS' is a trademark; it has been used by many firms over several years to indicate their own particular disk operating system.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Separate the proscriptions against trademarks and the term 'DOS diskettes' into different contexts.
RESOLUTION: Statement deleted, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-40
US_ISSUE: 182
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 1.13 page 34
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: The Concise OED has 'schemata' as the preferred with 'schemas'as secondary. The OED also has 'textual' as an adjective: "of, in, or concerning a text." This does not relate to biblical questions for me. Why not simply say "Do not use 'textual'? At the same time, add a proscription to the word 'mandate' when 'requirement' would do as well.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT through "Do not use 'textual'?" Do not understand the remainder of the comment, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-41
US_ISSUE: 183
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2 page 35
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: Somewhere in the document should appear a discussion of the organization of text which includes EXPRESS language. I am referring to the text string "EXPRESS Specification," the organization of attribute definitions, and the organization of propositions. This material is sufficiently similar, wherever EXPRESS appears that it should appear in this area of the document, not in discussions of individual document types. Such an inclusion would allow much of the repetitious material in clauses 3, 4,
and 5 to be omitted.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: DEFER, while I agree that it should be in clause 2 or as its own clause between current clause 2 and clause 3 (clauses 5 and 6 in SC4N537), but some elements that would appear in an AP would not appear in and IR or AIC (e.g., constants, procedures). I do not think that an AP or AIC should point to the IR clause 3.5. Need to split clause 3.5 out if we are going to do that. If we do this, someone needs to document it after the other comments have been incorporated, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-42
US_ISSUE: 184
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2 page 35
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: Something should be said about bolding EXPRESS names when used in running

text.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: DEFER: Disagreement between PRK and GAP. PRK proposed solution: Add to subclause 3.5.1 (General requirments): When appearing in running trext, all EXPRESS identifiers (schema names, entity names, attribute names, etc.) shall sppear in bold type face with underlines between component words. If hyphenation is required between component words, the hyphen shall appear after the underline symbol. Hyphens may occur between syllables of component words if appropriate." Remove section 2.2.2.7 (References to).

GAP reply: I disagree with this. At one time, the entities were bolded and the attributes were something else. If you have ever tried to document with the bolds and the underscores and the appropriate capitalization (for the Entity names), you find that the bold adds a lot of work for a little bit of clarity. (e.g., when the attribute is a single word or the entity name is the first word in a sentence.)

Also, if you reference an entity from a section where the
entity is not defined, you are to reference the section number for that entity . . . further clarification without the bolding . . . not sure where this is documented, but had to do it for AP 232.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-43
US_ISSUE: 185
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2 page 35
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: A style for EXPRESS reserved words in running text should be specified. I have found TeX smallcaps, all capitals, and lower case in different documents. I suggest all capitals (unless a small caps font were available).
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-44
US_ISSUE: 186
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2.1.2 page 36
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: It is unclear whether one is to separate individual
declarations (e.g., separate entity declarations within the entity section) or different declaration sections (e.g., separate entity from type). I suggest, also, that the list of declarative elements appear in the same order as that expected in a document.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-45
US_ISSUE: 187
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2.1.5.2 page 37

CLASSIFICATION: major technical
DESCRIPTION: It has always been a requirement for STEP that the normative EXPRESS can be extracted from the document source. It would be well to state this requirement as justification for the comment bracketing in this subclause. Such a statement would, for example, make it clear that embedded special characters not part of the EXPRESS should not appear within the brackets.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-46
US_ISSUE: 188
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2.1.11 page
39; example 12
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The '12' appears misplaced.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT, the layout is correct., PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-47
US_ISSUE: 189
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 2.1.14 page 41; paragraph starting "Each unique rule shall be..."
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: Subclause 2.1.3 requires that the colon and the label name not be separated by a space; this subclause asks that spaces be added to align the colons. This should be clarified. I suggest the requirement of 2.1.3 in order to clearly distinguish rule labels from attributes.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-48
US_ISSUE: 190
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2.2 page 41
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: I believe that attribute names fall within the category of "EXPRESS identifiers." Attribute names are not expected to be unique across even entity declarations.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-49
US_ISSUE: 191
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 2.2.2.3 page 43; paragraph starting "Append _set, _array..."
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: 2.2.2 requires that these elements never be appended.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-50
US_ISSUE: 192
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2.2.2.8 page 44
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: This section would be more clear if the word 'vertex' were bold whenever it appears. This is particularly true for the next-to-last sentence (starting "The plural of...").
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-51
US_ISSUE: 193
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 2.3.1 page 44
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: I find it difficult to associate the word 'behavior' with the concept illustrated in WR2. I doubt this helps in understanding the material.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT: the term "behavior"is correct, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-52
US_ISSUE: 194
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 2.3.1 page 44 paragraph starting "Of these three, only..."
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The term 'definition text' is not, to the best of my knowledge, defined. It should be. I take it to mean the text preceding the EXPRESS portion of an entity, type, function, or rule subclause.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
(optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK & GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-53
US_ISSUE: 195
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 2.4 page 45; Bullet starting "The typeface shall be..."
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The reference is to 1.2.2, not 1.1.2. I have noted that several of the references in the document are wrong. I hope this is simply due to a lack of regeneration of the document before printing.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:(optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-54
US_ISSUE: 196
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 2.4 page 46; bullet starting "Attributes ending on..." page number)
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: I cannot find annex G. If the reference is to annex G of the document being prepared, I cannot understand the exception; the requirement is clear that there be no exceptions.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, PRK.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-55
US_ISSUE: 197
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 3 page 46
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: I cannot understand the term 'integrated resource' as used in the second sentence. I would believe that each of the individual schemata in Part 41 is an individual integrated resource.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-56
US_ISSUE: 198
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 3.5.6 page 50; bullet starting "If the type is an enumeration..."
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: I would have expected it be a requirement that the items be defined.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Text should be added to explain when it is not necessary to do this.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-57
US_ISSUE: 199
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 3.5.6 page 50; bullet b)
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: This should be a requirement, not an option. PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change 'should' to 'shall.'
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-58
US_ISSUE: 200
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 3.5.6 page 51; bullet starting "Informal propositions follow..."
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: I do not understand the exception to include EXPRESS in a technical annex when

functions and procedures allow unelaborated EXPRESS.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: REJECT: there are cases where EXPRESS can be written for a smaller neighborhood than the entire STEP domain. This would be placed in the technical discussion annex and elaborated on (per the current document.) GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-59

US_ISSUE: 201

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 3.5.7.1 page
54; bullet starting "A reference to an attribute..."

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: I do not understand why this should not be a requirement.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change 'may' to 'shall.'

RESOLUTION: REJECT, when the subtype does not change the attribute defintion, the note is of little value. Personnel utilizing a subtyped IR should be looking at the IR supertype that the IR is subtyped to for attribute defintions, rules, and entity definitions. The subtype is a SUBTYPE of the supertype and should be used in that context, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-60

US_ISSUE: 202

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories

CLAUSE: 3.5.8 page 55; bullet starting "If there is only one rule..."

CLASSIFICATION: minor technical

DESCRIPTION: This should be a requirement.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change 'should' to 'shall.'

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-61

US_ISSUE: 203

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 3.6.1.1 page 60; note

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: I think 'the Secretariat' would be preferable to 'NIST.' There are several places in the document where this change should be made.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-62

US_ISSUE: 204

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 3.6.3 page 63

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: Subclauses 3.6.3.1 and 3.6.3.2 should appear in reverse order since the bibliography is to be the last annex. This comment also applies to 4.5.3 (page 68).

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-63

US_ISSUE: 205

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories

CLAUSE: 4 page 64; table 2

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: The table should have a border.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-64

US_ISSUE: 206

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 4.6 page 68

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: The reference is wrong. PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-65

US_ISSUE: 207

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.1 page 69

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: I believe that applying this requirement prevents individual EXPRESS elements in the short form from appearing in the list of contents. This is wrong and should be corrected.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: REJECT - this is consistant through out the document, EXPRESS elements are not found in the TOC but neither are the ARM elements. They are all found in the index. This is the adopted style. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-66

US_ISSUE: 208

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.4 page 71; table 3

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: Place the table in a border. PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, this table was made into a figure. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-67

US_ISSUE: 209

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.5.3 page 78; bullet starting "add the plural..." CLASSIFICATION: minor technical

DESCRIPTION: Change "assertion is greater than zero" to "assertion is greater than one".

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-68
US_ISSUE: 210
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.5.3.1 page 79
CLASSIFICATION: major technical
DESCRIPTION: Since EXPRESS fully specifies the cardinalities of a relation, the assertion subclause should be omitted. (Note that this may imply that INVERSE statements be added to the EXPRESS.)
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT & DEFER This issue is not an editorial issue to be reviewed at this time, but is defered for review for the hext version of the S.D.   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-69
US_ISSUE: 211
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 5.6.2 page 86; example text at top of page, last sentence
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: This sentence is difficult to understand.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify it.
RESOLUTION: Accept, "such itmes" changed to "select list items". Changed February 18, 1997 - LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-70
US_ISSUE: 212
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 5.6.2 page 87; paragraph starting An application protocol may require..."
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: This requirement appears to apply only when all attribute definitions are modified. An exception should be made when only a subset of the definitions are modified.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT, Issue is unclear and needs further explanation. Closed February 18, 1997 LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-71
US_ISSUE: 213
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.7 page 88; first paragraph
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: The reference should be specified as informative. (The effective normative reference is made through another path.)
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT, This is needed as normative because of other normative uses of the ATS in this subclause. It is noted that this section of the S.D. is defining how to place the ATS reference as informative in the AP document. , December 6, 1996

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-72

US_ISSUE: 214

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories

CLAUSE: 5.7 page 88; paragraph starting Additional conformance requirements..."

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: I think the reference should be to annex C, not annex D. If this is not the case, some explanation is in order as to what "specific types of implementation" is intended to mean.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution changed to annex C - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-73

US_ISSUE: 215

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.8.1.2 page 90

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: It is unclear whether all names in the expanded EXPRESS or only the names in the short form are to be defined.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: This should be clarified.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution words added that it is the expanded EXPRESS   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-74

US_ISSUE: 216

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories

CLAUSE: 5.8.1.4 page 91

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: The first paragraph undertakes to define "all options and conditional functions, elements of procedure..." and then proceeds to do this by means of a questionnaire. This, on the face of it, is not proper.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify.

RESOLUTION: REJECT, Issue is unclear and needs further explanation. Closed February 18, 1997 LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-75

US_ISSUE: 217

AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories

CLAUSE: 5.8.1.4 page91; first paragraph of required text

CLASSIFICATION: major editorial

DESCRIPTION: This text reads as if conformance classes are always required.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT text and boilerplate added to be used with an AP with only one class of conformance.   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-76

US_ISSUE: 218
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.8.2.1 page 92
CLASSIFICATION: major technical
DESCRIPTION: N433 states that only IDEF0 is acceptable for the AAM. PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Modify the last sentence of the first paragraph to reflect this.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT: changes made. Changed February 18, 1997 - LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-77
US_ISSUE: 219
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.8.2.5 page 95
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: Include a standard reference to IDEF0.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:(optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution words added   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-78
US_ISSUE: 220
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.8.2.5 page 95
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: The text reads as if EXPRESS-G is an option. 5.8.2.3 requires it.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Correct this.
RESOLUTION: Accept changes made. Changed February 18, 1997 - LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-79
US_ISSUE: 221
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.9 page 95
CLASSIFICATION: minor technical
DESCRIPTION: It is stated that inclusion of an object's location in the ARM or AIM diagrams is
optional. Either this should be required, or some explanation of when to do it and when not should
appear.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT: removed 'optional' changes made. Changed February 18, 1997 - LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-80
US_ISSUE: 222
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories
CLAUSE: 5.9 page 95 paragraph starting "Similarly, AIM elements...", second sentence
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Change "...the location of the AIM expanded listing..." to "...the location in the
AIM expanded listing...". The series in which thisterm appears should be separated by semicolons,
not commas.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-81
US_ISSUE: 223
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 5.9 page 96; last paragraph
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: The term '_uses_' is unclear. Remove the underlines and explain what is intended.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT '_uses_' changed to 'uses' - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: US PRK-82
US_ISSUE: 224
AUTHOR: P. R. Kennicott, Sandia National Laboratories CLAUSE: 6 page 96
CLASSIFICATION: major editorial
DESCRIPTION: There appears to be enough material in N434 of a documentation nature to expand this clause.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: (optional)
RESOLUTION: REJECT: the abstract test suite developers are responsible for providing the material that goes in this clause. As of this version of the S.D. they are not ready to do that, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DN1
US_ISSUE: 225
AUTHOR: Darla Nettles
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: I think we should remove the prohibition on the use of the word "textual" as an adjective. Conversely, if the prohibition is upheld, then the word "textual" which appears throughout the SD should be removed.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DN2
US_ISSUE: 226
AUTHOR: Darla Nettles
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The bibliography section should give an example of a
bibilographic reference for an international standard. Currently, there are no such examples; the examples given all have "authors". Also, the bibliography should be arranged in alphabetical order, not the order in which they are referenced in the text. (Otherwise, everytime you edit the document, you will have to check to see that the bibliographies entries are in the correct order) I know of no other instance where a bibliography is not in alphabetical order.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DN3
US_ISSUE: 227
AUTHOR: Darla Nettles
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Finally, once again, an appeal to reason on allowing a major clause to begin on a new page. This would greatly reduce the widow-orphan problem and save many many trees, because in general, a change at the front of the document ripples through most of the document, as causes many re-prints as widows and orphans are discovered, corrected, the document re-printed and more widows and orphans discovered, etc.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC1
US_ISSUE: 228
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: clause 1.2.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Is the year required in the heading for a CD document? The text indicates yes, however, the example does not show this.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC1
US_ISSUE: 229
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: clause 1.2.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The example of the page 1 header should update the year number or say "<specify year" for clarity
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC3
US_ISSUE: 230
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: clause 1.2.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The terms "copyright symbol" and "copyright sign" are both used in this clause. It would be clearer if only one term was used.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC4
US_ISSUE: 231
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: clause 1.2.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The ending quote mark is missing in the second to last sentence of the subclause.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC5
US_ISSUE: 232
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 1.3.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The first paragraph has a sentence stating "Beginning with the Scope clause, it".
What is "it" referring to in this sentence? Please clarify.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC6
US_ISSUE: 233
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 1.4.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Example 7 does not begin the <specify the title section on a new line as the text
describes. Is the <specify the title considered a section? What constitutes a section as described in
this subclause?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC7
US_ISSUE: 234
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 1.4.3
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Is there a recommended order for the Normative References? Should they be
alphabetical by standard and numerical by part number within a standard?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER: address when rewording this clause to include new requirements in
ISO/IEC Directives Part 3, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC8

US_ISSUE: 235
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 1.5.4.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:
The wrong clause reference is given. "specified in 1.2.1" should be 1.2.2
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC9
US_ISSUE: 236
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 2.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: One of the additions to the document was that exceptions to one of the bullets would be given in annex C. However, there is no annex C in this document. It should be added.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: AGREE, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC10
US_ISSUE: 237
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 3.5.7.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: It is not clear whether each formal proposition should contain the colon within the boldface or not. It is difficult to tell in the example whether the colon is bold or not.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: AGREE, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC11
US_ISSUE: 238
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 3.6.1.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The last sentence of the first paragraph should be changed to refer to clause 1.4.3 where the normative reference format was moved.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: AGREE, GAP.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC12
US_ISSUE: 239
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 4

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Table 2 contains a typographical error. Function is misspelled.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: AGREE, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC13
US_ISSUE: 240
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 4.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for the AIC short listing is incomplete. The addition of boilerplate text was agreed to in the WG4/P6 meeting at the Dallas ISO to clarify implicit referencing.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Add two sentences to note 1 to read:
NOTE 1 - There may be subtypes and items of select lists that appear in the integrated resources that are not imported into the AIC. Constructs are eliminated from the subtype tree or select list through the use of the implicit interface rules of ISO 10303-11. References to eliminated constructs are outside the scope of the AIC. In some cases, all items of the select list are eliminated. Because AICs are intended to be implemented in the context of an application protocol, the items of the select list will be defined by the scope of the application protocol.
RESOLUTION: ACCEDPT. LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC14
US_ISSUE: 241
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 4.4
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for the AIC short listing is incomplete. The addition of boilerplate text was agreed to in the WG4/P6 meeting at the Dallas ISO to clarify independently instantiated entities in the Fundamental concepts and assumptions of the AIC short form.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Add the following boilerplate statement for a Fundamental concepts and assumptions sub-clause. The statement is intended to be the introduction to a list of AIM entities.

The following entities are intended to be independently instantiated in the application protocol schemas that use this AIC:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC15
US_ISSUE: 242
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 4.5.2.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for the AIC EXPRESS-G diagram annex is incomplete. The addition of a note was agreed to in the WG4/P6 meeting at the Dallas ISO to clarify selects that are implicitly referenced but outside the scope of the AIC.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add the following boilerplate note statement for annex C of the AIC.

NOTE - The following select types: <select type1, <select type 2, and <select type n, are interfaced into the AIC expanded listing according to the implicit interface rules of ISO 10303-11. These select types are not referenced by other entities in this part of ISO 10303.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC16

US_ISSUE: 243

AUTHOR: D. Craig

CLAUSE: 5.4

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: In the list of terms defined in part 1, product data has an underscore. However, it is defined in part 1 without an underscore.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the underscore in product_data

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC17

US_ISSUE: 244

AUTHOR: D. Craig

CLAUSE: 5.5.2.2

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: The supertype statemements given on the bottom of page 76 should indicate that in addition to IDEF1X complete categorization, the first statement is used for an EXPRESS ABSTRACT ONEOF supertype. The second statement is used for an EXPRESS ONEOF supertype that is not ABSTRACT.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "(IDEF1X complete categorization)" to "(IDEF1X complete categorization and EXPRESS ABSTRACT ONEOF supertype)". Change "(IDEF1X incomplete categorization)" to "(IDEF1X incomplete categorization and EXPRESS ONEOF supertype)"

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC18

US_ISSUE: 245

AUTHOR: D. Craig

CLAUSE: 5.5.3

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: What is meant by "primary or forward order"? From a modelling perspective, this would be from parent to child. However, from an implementation perspective, it is necessary to know the dependencies of an object. Has this order been defined any where. Has QP made any statements about the meaning of "primary or forward order"?

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution see MS-72 - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC19
US_ISSUE: 246
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Since AICs are not referenced by an AP unless they are at the same level as the AP, the wording of the boilerplate for column 3 of the mapping table should be changed. The last sentence should be deleted because there is no need for an "AIC reference" number. The part number of the AIC is used. Therefore the phrase "or the application interpreted constructs" should be inserted into the first sentence.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change the column 3 boilerplate to: Column 3) Source: For those AIM elements that are interpreted from the integrated resources or the application interpreted constructs, this is the number of the corresponding part of ISO 10303. For those AIM elements that are created for the purpose of this part of ISO 10303, this is the number of this part.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC20
US_ISSUE: 247
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The definition of the line continuation symbol in the list of symbols   defined in the boilerplate for the mapping table is written in a style   that does not match the other definitions.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Rewrite the definition of the symbol
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution definition was rewritten - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC21
US_ISSUE: 248
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The list of symbols defined in the boilerplate for the mapping table is incomplete. Additional symbols were agreed to in the WG4/P3 meeting at   the Dallas ISO. These should be included. They are described in the Mapping Table Guidelines (SC4 N436)
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution- update list see QT-16,17, &18 - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC22
US_ISSUE: 249
AUTHOR: D. Craig

CLAUSE: 5.7
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for clause 6 includes the wrong name for the expansion of PICS.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "The Protocol Information Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma"   to "The Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC23
US_ISSUE: 250
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.8.1.5
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The text refers to clause 3.6.1.2 for the normative reference that is required. This information has been moved out of that clause and placed   in 1.4.3
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC24
US_ISSUE: 251
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.8.1.5
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for the annex includes xxxxxx_schema. However, this does   not match the schema naming convention used in the APs. APs do not have   "_schema" at the end.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove "_schema" and "-schema" in the boilerplate.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC25
US_ISSUE: 252
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.8.1.5
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for the annex has a typographical error.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "areassigned" to "are assigned".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC26
US_ISSUE: 253
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 3.6.1.2, 4.5.1.2, and 5.8.1.5 CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: It is not clear to the part editor that the version number given in the boilerplate will change with each version of the document. Where is this information available for the part editor?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Provide information about how to change the version number for each

document status.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT. See QT51 issue. Changed February 18, 1997 - LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC27
US_ISSUE: 254
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.8.2.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for annex F is redundant: "a set of activity figures that   contain the activity diagrams". Why is it necessary to state both activity figures and activity diagrams?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change the phrase to "a set of activity diagrams"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC28
US_ISSUE: 255
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.8.2.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The boilerplate for annex G is incomplete. There is a section that states the correct graphical form should be inserted. When this is done,   the sentence is left hanging: "The graphical form of the application reference model is presented in the EXPRESS-G."
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Complete the sentence or remove the word "the" before the language name.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC29
US_ISSUE: 256
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.9
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The first third paragraph states that an index entry would be given for "the location of the AIM element where it appears in the AIM element   column of the mapping table,". This does not match what the Qualification Project agreed to. QP agreed that an index entry would be given anywhere in the mapping table that an AIM entity defined in the short form appears.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change this statement to "the location of an AP specific AIM element where it appears in the mapping table".
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC30
US_ISSUE: 257
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.9
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: The first two paragraphs of the sub-clause have hard returns in the middle.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the hard returns
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC31
US_ISSUE: 258
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.9
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: The second to last paragraph of the sub-clause is not full justification.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Correct the justification of this paragraph
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC32
US_ISSUE: 259
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 6
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Table 5 should be left-justified not centered.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: Table deleted, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-DC33
US_ISSUE: 260
AUTHOR: D. Craig
CLAUSE: 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Since an AIC is used as the source for all entities that are obtained through the AIC, the boilerplate needs to clarify this.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a note to the column 3 boilerplate:
NOTE - Entities or types that are defined within the integrated resources have an AIC as the source reference if the use of the entity or type for the mapping is within the scope of the AIC.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT: not added as a note but as informative text. Completed February 18, 1997 - LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS1
US_ISSUE: 261
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: first paragraph refers to the document 'Guidelines for the development of the mapping tables'. Should this be found in a Normative reference rather than a bibliography?

PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS2
US_ISSUE: 262
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1, page 81
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1, page 81 third item of list:
'When the mapping is to IDENTICAL MAPPING OR PATH, no source is pruned.' There is no information in the mapping table guidelines that say this. If source is not pruned then the mapping table guidelines should also indicate the same information. And if the mapping table guidelines does indicate that source is not pruned it should expand on what is pruning.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT see QT-14 - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS3
US_ISSUE: 263
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 81
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 81 last paragraph before boiler text: 'Because of the text contained in this required wording, the format for the list has been varied slightly from the usually required'

Reading this sentence makes no sense. Maybe it should read something like: 'Because of the special characters used in the lists in the required wording, the format of the list shall be formatted as a second level list (see 1.2.6)'
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS4
US_ISSUE: 264
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 82
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 82 : The mapping table guidelines section 6.1.6 defines "<". for enclosed sections in a reference path. Add this symbol to the list.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT see QT-16 - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS5
US_ISSUE: 265

AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 82
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 82: The mapping table guidelines section 6.1.8 defines "‖" for enclosed supertypes in a reference path. Add this symbol to the list.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT see QT-17 - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS6
US_ISSUE: 266
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 82,
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 82, list item k: '\: the line continuations for strings that wrap.' This item is not defined in the mapping table guidelines.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT see QT-18 - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS7
US_ISSUE: 267
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 5.6.1 page 84
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 5.6.1 page 84, mapping table example. This is an example of who to do a mapping table so use the S.D. format for it: table is landscape, header and page number are in portrait.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT see QT-19 - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS8
US_ISSUE: 268
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: General issue that Supplementary Directives needs sections for: Normative references, Definitions, Abbreviations.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS9
US_ISSUE: 269
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: Annex B

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Annex B: If the Supplementary Directives are to become a 'standing document' then the reverences in the Bibliography to Guidelines for AIC development, Guidelines for the development and approval of application protocols, Guidelines for the development of mapping tables, and Guidelines for the development of abstract test suites should be removed and placed in the Normative Reference section of this document.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS10
US_ISSUE: 270
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 4, page 63
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 4, page 63: The 'Guidelines for AIC Development" should go in a Normative Reference.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS11
US_ISSUE: 271
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: clause 4, page 64
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: clause 4, page 64: Table 2 is not a table, it is an outline and should be defined as an outline. If a table is ready required then use the S.D. clause 1.7.1 format. Tables shall be bordered.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS12
US_ISSUE: 272
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:There are no guidelines for the structure of the index of the AIC document. What should it look like and what thing should go in the index ?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS13
US_ISSUE: 273
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky

CLAUSE: Clause 5.7, page 88
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Clause 5.7, page 88: This section documents the contents of AP clause 6 conformance requirements and gives a boiler plate text that gets added. However every AP I have reviewed has a conformance class table that mappes all the AIM elements to the various conformance classes. Ther is also a list of the various classes. The format of this list and the table are not defined and should be.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT more information has been added to show the format of the conformance table. But there should be no list of confromance classes. There shall be a seperate subclause for each class along with description as stated in this section of the S.D.   - see issue QT-25 December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-LS14
US_ISSUE: 274
AUTHOR: Len Slovensky
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: There needs to be a decision made on the requirements of the AAM diagrams. Should they follow the FIPS or can they be allowed to deviate
from the FIPS standard (modified).
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: DEFER, Guidance on this should be given in the next version of the S.D., JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-1
US_ISSUE: 275
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: Table 1, p. 2
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Table title is less than 14 pt. as called out in 1.2.2,
Acceptable fonts, and 1.7.1.2.4, this document
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change table title to font size 14 pt.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-2
US_ISSUE: 276
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.2.2, p. 3
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: First NOTE, "Words being defined" is in quotes, but the phrase above states "words that are defined"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to match reference text
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-3
US_ISSUE: 277
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.2.3, p. 4-5
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Widow line on page 5
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Correct per 1.2.4.3, this document
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-4
US_ISSUE: 278
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.2.4.3, p.
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: In title, word "Widows" is capitalized
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Do not capitalize "Widow" in title per 1.2.4.1, p. 5,
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-5
US_ISSUE: 279
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.2.6, p. 8
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
In first paragraph, "parenthes" spelled incorrectly
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "parenthesis"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-6
US_ISSUE: 280
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.3.3, p. 12
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
Sixth paragraph from bottom of page, 1st sentence does not make sense. "...with the following statements covering annexes are required."
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Change to read "...with the following required statements covering annexes."
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-7

US_ISSUE: 281
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.14, p. 35
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
ext is not consistently indented
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
After the "_part", indent the text to be consistent with previous entries
RESOLUTION: REJECT, there is no problem with the original, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-8
US_ISSUE: 282
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 2.2.1, p. 41
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Title appears at bottom of page by itself - violation of 1.2.4.1
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Keep title and text together on the next page.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-9
US_ISSUE: 283
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 2.2.2.7, p. 43
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
There is only one space between number and title.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Put in two spaces per 1.2.4.1.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-10
US_ISSUE: 284
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 2.2.2.8, p. 44
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
There is only one space between number and title.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Put in two spaces per 1.2.4.1.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-11
US_ISSUE: 285
AUTHOR: Boeing

CLAUSE: Figure 1, p. 53
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Title of figure is less than 14 pt.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change title font size to 14 pt as called out in 1.2.2,
Acceptable fonts, and 1.7.1.2.4, this document
RESOLUTION: REJECT, original copy is correct, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-12
US_ISSUE: 286
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: Table A.1, p. 60
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
Title of table is less than 14 pt.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Change title font size to 14 pt as called out in 1.2.2, Acceptable fonts, and 1.7.1.2.4, this document
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-13
US_ISSUE: 287
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: Table 3, p. 71
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Title of table is less than 14 pt.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change title font size to 14 pt as called out in 1.2.2, Acceptable fonts,
and 1.7.1.2.4, this document
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-14
US_ISSUE: 288
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: Table 3, p. 71
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Table is not boxed in.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Box in table per 1.7.1.2.1, this document
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-15
US_ISSUE: 289
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 5.2.2.1 a), p. 75
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: Extra space between words "...shall be...", last line
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete extra space per 1.2.4, second paragraph, this document
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-16
US_ISSUE: 290
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 5.6.2, p. 83
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: 2nd paragraph, 1st line, last word "wirtter"
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change word to "written"
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-17
US_ISSUE: 291
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 5.8.1.4, p. 91
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: 1st para. of example for document text, 3rd sentence does reads
"...combinations of options are likely to implemented together."
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "...combinations of options are likely to be implemented
together."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-18
US_ISSUE: 292
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 5.8.1.5, p. 92
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Under E2 example, 1st paragraph, last line reads "...areassigned..."
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Put space between words ..."are assigned..."
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT proposed solution - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-19
US_ISSUE: 293
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 6   Table 5, p. 96
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Table is not boxed in
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Per 1.7.1.2.1, this document, tables should be boxed in.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-20

US_ISSUE: 294
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.1 Acceptable word processor
CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical
DESCRIPTION:
Designating any specific word processor is inappropriate. 1) Any vendor products should not be promoted by ISO standard. 2) It is not necessary to define a specific word processor format since any document can be written out in many different format these days by publication software. 3) How long will DOS be supported?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete this clause.
RESOLUTION: REJECT, this clause has been reworded to provide additional guidance on word processors that the SC4 Secretariat requires, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-21
US_ISSUE: 295
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.2.6 Format for lists in parts of ISO 10303, page 8
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical
DESCRIPTION: The sentence "Either item _ a long dash (in WordPerfect) or a medium dash (in LaTeX) followed by a space" is too specific for a standard specification.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete this sentence.
RESOLUTION: REJECT, do not understand the objection, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-22
US_ISSUE: 296
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.2.6 Format for lists in parts of ISO 10303, page 9
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical
DESCRIPTION: Notes 1 is too specific for a standard spec.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete this Note 1.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: Notes 1 and 2 were deleted, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-23
US_ISSUE: 297
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.3.3.2 Introduction, page 13
CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
This clause (An Introduction is required. The Introduction shall not contain requirements but may contain _) is unclear and needs reinforcement.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change the second sentence to read " The Introduction should say what the subject is (definition), why the subject is important (usefulness), and what to look for (key points)

in the subsequent sections."
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-24
US_ISSUE: 298
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.3.3.4 Wording for the introduction, page 15
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
The paragraph, "This International Standard is _. " is difficult to understand without proper description of terminology in general terms.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
Provide a brief description for each terminology (e.g. application
interpreted constructs) or a reference clause that defines the termonology.
RESOLUTION: REJECT, Do not understand this comment. There is an introduction for each series of parts of ISO 10303, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-25
US_ISSUE: 299
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.3.3.2 Introduction, page 13
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
This clause (An Introduction is required. The Introduction shall not contain requirements but may contain _) is unclear and needs reinforcement.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change the second sentence to read " The Introduction should say what the subject is (definition), why the subject is important (usefulness), and what to look for (key points) in the subsequent sections."
RESOLUTION: REJECT, this is the same comment as 297, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-26
US_ISSUE: 300
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: Major, Editorial
CLASSIFICATION: 1.7.1 Tables, page 24
DESCRIPTION:
It is uncertain if any clause specifies title and id number for a table.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a sentence to read, "Tables must include a title and identification number and may include a legend if necessary."
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-27
US_ISSUE: 301
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: 1.7.2 Figures, page 26
CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
Figures need a title and an id number.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a sentence to read, "Figures must include a title and identification number and may include a legend if necessary."
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Boeing N432-28
US_ISSUE: 302
AUTHOR: Boeing
CLAUSE: Generic
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION:
Methods documents, while not mandatory for Parts and APs, should at the very least put forth an example and follow the instructions put forth in the methods documents for formatting and text.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Follow the methods documents for formatting and text arrangements as an example of how the Parts and APs should be written.
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP1
US_ISSUE: 303
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: For IRs, what about the index? Prior policy was that the Index was from the EXPRESS definition and not from the Section Number. There is no words for anything on Index in document today.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP2
US_ISSUE: 304
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Examples. When an appendix contains only examples, the font for the appendix should be the regular font for the words (and not the Example font) and each example should not be indented (Currently the examples are indented from the regular text). The appendix is Informative.

This issue is against IRs, APs, and AIC documentation.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW>

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP3
US_ISSUE: 305
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:Documentation of an AP ARM, where the ARM is in EXPRESS (Section 5.5.3.1 of the document). The words for this are not sufficient in the document today. Some of the documentation requirements are obvious, some are not. What about the EXPRESS as an Annex? How are he words to be documented for a SELECT, for a BASE TYPE, for SUBTYPES, for SUPERTYPES, for ABSTRACT SUPERTYPES, for OPTIONAL ATTRIBUTES, for INVERSES, for LOCAL and GLOBAL RULES, for SETS, for LISTS, for ARRAY, for ....? See ISO 10303-232 for examples of the correct words for the EXPRESS elaboration.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT - ARM example and clause 4 example added , December 6, 1996, LWS.
ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP4
US_ISSUE: 306
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: Section 5.6.1
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:Section 5.6.1. Need to include the < symbols and the meaning for the mapping table.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT see QT-16 , December 6, 1996, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP5
US_ISSUE: 307
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: Page 81
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 81, The mapping tables are set up so that each UoF has a separate table and not a single table as shown.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT, the 5.6.1 definition states that each UoF shal be documented in a seperate table. The table shown is an example., December 6, 1996, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP6
US_ISSUE: 308
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: Page 58, Section 3.6.2.1

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 58, Section 3.6.2.1 EXPRESS listing, NOTE. Should 'NIST'
be in the NOTE or 'SC4 Secretariat' be in the NOTE. This could change over the years.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, JDW.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP7
US_ISSUE: 309
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: Page 83, Section 5.6.2
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Page 83, Section 5.6.2, The introduction to the documentation of the imported
entity and type definitions. The base definition of the <constrcut name <entity or type is given in
ISO 10303-xxx:X.X.X. The following modifications apply to this part of ISO 10303. The X.X.X
is not defined. If the X.X.X is the year, this is wrong. The normative references (Section 2.0) give
the year of the document and the rest of the document should only give the base number.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT - the X.X.X use has been removed , December 6, 1996, LWS.
ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-GP8
US_ISSUE: 310
AUTHOR: Greg Paul
CLAUSE: Secion 5.6.1.
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Secion 5.6.1. What do you do about Informal Propositions with the mapping table?
Identify them as a Rule and then write the Informal Proposition in the Import Entity modifications
section of the document?
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT, Informal propositions do not show up in the mapping table. The Clause
5 informal proposition is linked to clause 4.2 definitions., December 6, 1996, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT1
US_ISSUE: 311
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION:Major: An AP is a document with two models, an ARM and an AIM. There is no
consistency between the way the two models are documented.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT: This issue is directed to a different group. This issue should be directed
to an other document, probably the AP guidelines. Closed February 18, 1997 - LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT2
US_ISSUE: 312

AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Editorial: There is no requirement to document SELECT types and the justification for including them in the ARM.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ACCEPT - ARM example and clause 4 example added, see QT-25 , December 6, 1996

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT3
US_ISSUE: 313
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Editorial: There is no requirement to document ENUMERATION types and the justication for including them in the ARM.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ARM example and clause 4 example added, see QT-25 , December 6, 1996

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT4
US_ISSUE: 314
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial
DESCRIPTION: Editorial: There is no requirement to document defined types and the justification for including them in the ARM.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: ARM example and clause 4 example added, see QT-25 , December 6, 1996

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT5
US_ISSUE: 315
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: Major editorial
DESCRIPTION:Editorial, Major: The ARM document requirements were design with a small number of application objects in mind. This design does not scale up well. Example: The subclauses all have the same font size and are always bolded. This makes it unduly tiring on the reader for a large ARM. PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT & DEFER This issue has been presented to ISO in Geneva with no concessions on their part.. The subclauses shall have the larger font (14 pt) until ISO says otherwise. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT6

US_ISSUE: 316
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: major
DESCRIPTION:Major: There is no requirement for the EXPRESS of an ARM to be included in the document. Only the EXPRESS-G has to be provided.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: Reject issue. I agree with the issue, but it probably should be an AP guidelines issue. Closed February 18, 1997, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT7
US_ISSUE: 317
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: Major
DESCRIPTION: Major: There is no support for large format EXPRESS-G diagrams ("D, E" size).
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT & DEFER This issue is not an editorial issue to be reviewed at this time, but is defered for review for the next version of the S.D. This issue references AP214, this AP has developed its EXPRESS model into the required EXPRESS-G diagrams with off page connectors, and added another informative index which contained the "wall paper" size model. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT8
US_ISSUE: 318
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: General
CLASSIFICATION: minor
DESCRIPTION:minor:
There is no specification for how to state that an application object is the same concept as a concept in an IR.
PROPOSED SOLUTION:
RESOLUTION: REJECT for two reasons: 1) If the ARM definitions are the same as the IR definitions it is suspect aht the ARM has not been developed in the terms of the application expert. In thisw case it is recommended that the terms be reviewed and reworked. 2) If a definition is exactly the same as a definiton in an other existing ISO document the ISO directives part 3 define the structure for referencing another ISO document. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT9
US_ISSUE: 319
AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman
CLAUSE: 4.3
CLASSIFICATION: major

DESCRIPTION:major:

The requirement for clause 4.3 in the case of an EXPRESS ARM is a gross waste of paper and environmentally unfriendly. Both AP210 and AP214 use computer programs to generate this clause, so as not to waste the time of the quality committee (or our own) in proving that it is correct. Clause 4.3 is 150 pages in the case of ap210. Don't know about ap214.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: Reject, This is a statment of concern, but is not an issue against the S.D. Closed February 18, 1997, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT10

US_ISSUE: 320

AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman

CLAUSE: Genraral

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION: minor:

The example for the use of an EXPRESS ARM uses ineffective presentation style. The ap210 project has found that if the "bubbles always go up" the reader finds it much easier to understand the concepts presented. This is a similar requirement to that long standing in hardware design for schematics in Western Cultures that signal flow is from left to right, and top to bottom. Due to the inclusion of subtype trees, we have found it easiest if the subtype trees flow down and the attributes flow up.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: REJECT: The example is informative and does not mandate the way an EXPRESS-G diagram MUST be presented. This is done in the EXPRESS (part22) document. This issue should be presented against that docuement. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT11

US_ISSUE: 321

AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: minor editorial

DESCRIPTION:major:

There is no requirement to assign an unambiguous object name to the ARM model. Since this is a fundamental requirements model, it needs an object name just as well as the AIM schema does.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: REJECT:There has been no name assigned to the ARM model because there was never a requirement for the ability to implement the ARM model. There is still no approved requirement for an implementable ARM.. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA N432-TT12

US_ISSUE: 322

AUTHOR: Thomas Thurman

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: major

DESCRIPTION: This document does not allow the EXPRESS text for an application object to be included in clause 4.2, in the case where the ARM model is in EXPRESS. It is much easier for the domain expert to understand the model for review if the EXPRESS is available in the same location as the definition. Reference the EDIF standard and the AIM for examples of this usage.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: REJECT: the problem with this method is having the EXPRESS-G included in clause 4.2 normatively and in Annex G informatively. This is a conflict and it has been decided not to allow it included in clause 4.2.   - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Hughes SD-1

US_ISSUE: 323

AUTHOR: HUGHES

CLAUSE: GENERIC

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The document as presented is not well organized. A user does not have a clear method of discovering the subject about which he is attempting to find guidance.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: The document should be reorganized and presented roughly in exactly the same order of contents as is an Application Protocol. In that manner the user can find both discussion and precise examples to follow for every clause and annex in an AP. The index should reflect this reorganization.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION: ACCEPT, Effort is being made to make the document more friendly. But there is no plan at this time to have IRs, APs, AICs to be seperated into seperate documents at this time. Closed February 18, 1997 LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Hughes SD-2

US_ISSUE: 324

AUTHOR: HUGHES

CLAUSE: GENERIC

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The document as presented is written around the use of an IDEF ARM data model. With the more frequent, and potentially highly recommended, use of an EXPRESS ARM data model, the Supplemental Directives should be more clearly written to utilize the capabilities of an EXPRESS ARM, if it is the chosen modeling format.

For example, there are no documentation possibilities or requirements to document and define SELECT types and ENUMERATION types in the ARM.

For example, there are no documentation examples or requirements to document and define defined types in the ARM.

For example, inverse relationships would be more clearly found and understood by an implementor

or a user if they were included together with the other attributes of an object in Clause 4.2, rather than being in Clause 4.3. In the case of AP210, the comments received by our reviewers indicated that Clause 4.3, which is largely a restatement of the cardinality rules of an EXPRESS model, is nearly unread. Having inverse relationships buried in this difficult clause makes an accurate and complete understanding of the ARM contents harder to convey. An example sentence structure for the definition of inverse relationships in Clause 4.2 should be added to the Supplemental Directives. An example of a sentence of this type may be found in the AP210 draft DIS document.

For example, the entire Clause 4.3 is an unnecessary part of an EXPRESS-modeled ARM, if the EXPRESS model were to be included in addition to the EXPRESS-G. Tabular presentation of the cardinality rules, for example, would more clearly convey this information in the event that the EXPRESS text were chosen not to be included in the ARM. Constraints other than cardinality should be documented in Clause 4.2, which can then become the single best section in the ARM for implementor, domain expert, and user reference.

For example, explicitly stated Unique Rules and Where Rules, from an EXPRESS ARM model, should be included in Clause 4.2 if used. These Formal Propositions should be written in English as well as included in the EXPRESS text in the ARM. This reinforces the use of this clause as the single best section in the ARM for the use of the implementor, the domain expert, and the user of the AP. Examples may be found in the AP210 draft DIS document.

For example, in the case of a complex hierarchy of SUPERTYPE and SUBTYPE, with ANDOR and with ONEOF included, the Supplemental Directives should be precise with an example for the definition of these objects. Examples may be found in the AP210 draft DIS document.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Suggested solutions will be found in each of the examples above.
RESOLUTION: DEFER, Issue has value to be investigated in the future, but to big of an impact at this time. Should be sent to AP guidelines. REJECT - Febraury 18, 1997, LWS.

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Hughes SD-3
US_ISSUE: 325
AUTHOR: HUGHES
CLAUSE: GENERIC
CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Application objects in an ARM which, in domain terms, are identical in definition to objects in an Integrated Resource, should be defined in Clause 4.2 of the ARM. However, these definitions from the IR should NOT be restated in the AP.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: A clear example sentence should be included in the Supplemental Directives which refers the reader to the precise definition in the Integrated Resource in question.
RESOLUTION: REJECT for two reasons: 1) If the ARM definitions are the same as the IR definitions it is suspect aht the ARM has not been developed in the terms of the application expert. In thisw case it is recommended that the terms be reviewed and reworked. 2) If a definition is exactly the same as a definiton in an other existing ISO document the ISO directives part 3 define the structure for referencing another ISO document. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Hughes SD-4
US_ISSUE: 326
AUTHOR: HUGHES
CLAUSE: GENERIC
CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: AIM entity and attribute definitions are not provided, in the Supplemental Directives, with a clear example sentence structure. A reference is made, if it can be found in the document, to the sentence structure used in Integrated Resources. A quick review of ANY Integrated Resource document will show that there is presently little if any consistency among definition format, even in the same IR document.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Provide clear example sentence structure for AIM entity and attribute definitions, and provide them in an easily found reference which includes the reason for their being.
RESOLUTION: REJECT - Some might agree that the IR's don't supply good examples for definitions, it is the correct place to go for the information. March 14, 1997, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Hughes SD-5
US_ISSUE: 327
AUTHOR: HUGHES
CLAUSE: GENERIC
CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: EXPRESS-G normative or illustrative reference graphics must be presented in A-size or A4-size paper output, within the AP. For an AP with just a few objects, neither the AIM EXPRESS-G nor the ARM EXPRESS-G cause this requirement to be unreasonable.

However, with a larger number of objects, such as AP210 with over 700 ARM objects, and AP214 with its extensive model, doing an EXPRESS-G model on small sheets of paper is a non-value-added task.

In fact, with the large number of off-page connectors that result in breaking an EXPRESS-G model of a Unit of Functionality in AP210 into several sheets, the model becomes extremely difficult to understand, even for the modelers.

Many hours of non-value-added labor will be required for AP210 in order to recreate, and edit for proper fit on small sheets of paper, the EXPRESS-Gmodels from the AP.

The purpose of STEP is to help reduce the need for drawings and to help increase the use of data; STEP should not limit itself to being a PAPER distribution alone.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: In the interest of clear communication to the implementor, the domain expert, and the other users of the AP, an option should be available which allows either a hard copy of a large sheet model and/or the electronic form of that model in a proprietary or de-facto standard print file to be available.
RESOLUTION: REJECT & DEFER This issue is not an editorial issue to be reviewed at this time,

but is defered for review for the next version of the S.D. This issue references AP214, this AP has developed its EXPRESS model into the required EXPRESS-G diagrams with off page connectors, and added another informative index which contained the "wall paper" size model. - December 6, 1996, LWS

ISSUE NUMBER: USA Hughes SD-6

US_ISSUE: 328

AUTHOR: HUGHES

CLAUSE: GENERIC

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There is no accommodation for the potential use of SGML as a publication tool. I'll leave it to others more aware of the technical aspects of this requirement, to raise specific issues on this subject.

However, related to this point are the following concerns which have come to mind as we work on the DIS version of AP210.

Illustrations: AP210 will include many illustrations in the ARM, at the very least. These will be created and included for the specific purpose of clearly communicating the requirements of the domain. Using an SGML tagged file for AP210's Clause 4.2, we have a method to include the reference to the appropriate figure. We believe that the appropriate Supplemental Directive statement should be made which allows each figure to begin at the top of a page (in our case, the next page following the tag reference to that illustration). By allowing, but probably not requiring, an illustration to be placed at the top of a page, output from the SGML system will be enabled to be automatic with no editing of format.

Widows and orphans: While it is of interest to reduce the amount of white space on each sheet of a document, and it is of interest as well to reduce the widows and orphans within a document, it is also important to make an Application Protocol easily understandable by its implementors, domain expert reviewers, and other users. AP210's team, in creating its review copy of Clause 4.2, has found that readability has been enhanced by beginning each new Application Object in Clause 4.2 at the top of a new page, and continuing the definitions, examples, notes, and illustrations of that Object on as many pages as are required for completeness, specifically followed by a page break to a new page. This sometimes results in a relatively large amount of white space at the end of an Object's subclause. I believe that the benefits of better understandability should override the desire for reduced white space and some otherwise well intentioned requirements for widows and orphans.

Subclause font size: AP210's CD comments included several pertaining to the readability of Clause 4.2 and other, similar clauses, in which the documentation has several layers of subclause numbering indentures. The commenters suggested that the subclause title, such as 4.2.x.y, should be printed in a smaller font size than the clause title, such as 4.2.x. With an AP with as many ARM objects and AIM objects as has AP210, it is in the interest of readability to make each major subclause stand out from its subordinate subclauses. Examples of what we believe to be improvements in the readability

may be found in the AP210 draft DIS document, as printed using the NIST SGML tools, modified in accordance with our team request for readability.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Proposed solutions may be found in each of the examples cited above. RESOLUTION: REJECT & DEFER This issue is not an editorial issue to be reviewed at this time, but is defered for review for the next version of the S.D.   - December 6, 1996, LWS

The comments that follow were received during the review of the N537 version of the Supplementary Directives. They could not be included in the N537 version of the S.D. because of time restraints or lack of ballot comments to tie them to. However, because they seem worthwhile, they are listed here in hopes that they will be considered for the next version of the S.D. Each comment is followed by the initials of the commentor. DN is Darla Nettles, RP is Robin Penley, and PRK is Phil Kennicott. NOTE: The page and subclause numbers given in the following comments refer to the N537 version of the Supplementary Directives.

1. There are examples that are not preceded by "EXAMPLE X and this occurs randomly thoughtout the document. Make the examples consistent, as in example 11 on page 20. The indenting should replace the text that is verbatium, while the examples to follow should be preceded by "EXAMPLE X. On page 22, the full reference for ISO/IEC 8824-1 should be indented since it is placed verbatium in all parts of ISO 10303 and the other bibliographic examples and models should be marked as examples. DN

2. In subclause 5.1.1, instead of USE or REFERENCE statements, should it be USE FROM or REFERNCE FROM statements? DN

3. In subclause 6.5.4, last line: Since ISO doesn't like the "/", should this "supertype/subtype hierarchy" be "supertype-subtype" hierarchy? DN

4. Since SGML is mentioned, include guidelines for what type of SGML, its use, and explanation of the DTD. RP

5. Subclause 4.2.4 should include a statement that a figure representing the planning model should be included in the Introduction. RP

6. Text for introduction to application protocols should be revisited. RP

7. Page 85, for the value of the attributes a shown in 4.2.1.4.1 type 1, a smaller boldface font is used for a clause heading, but this formattting in not mentioned anywhere in teh SC. Also, there is no mention of how to document values of attributed. There should be a new subclause 8.5.2.3 titled "Format for values of the attributes" with the explanatory paragraph. RP

8. Page 100, subclause 8.8.2.1.2, boilerplate should mention that IDEFO modelling format is a "modified IDEFO activity modelling format."

9. Page 101, subclause 8.8.2.5 should remove EXPRESS-G as the modelling format for annex G. It should read something like " . . . IDEFO activity modelling format and to the modelling format used for annex G, if EXPRESS-G is not used." versus ". . . IDEFO activity modelling format and to the EXPRESS-G format used for annex G." RP

10. A search should be made for EXPRESS reserved words that are lower case. PRK

11. Page 46, 5.2.1: The issue of proper names will bit us in the future. I am not familiar with an instance of a proper name per se in STEP but words such as "boolean" and "cartesian" that are derived from proper names do appear. Those instances with which I am familar are all lower case. Should these be changed. Or, should we distinguish between names and words derived from names? PRK

12. Page 47, subclause 5.2.2.2: We have a problem with the words "subtype" and "supertype". Are these EXPRESS reserved words or may they be orginary words. I personally think they are always reserved words and should be all capitals. If the other case is adopted, Part 1 needs definitions for these words. PRK

13. Page 47, subclause 5.2.2.3: If my suggestion with respect to bolding EXPRESS identifiers is adopted, "text," "x," and "x.text" need to be in bold. PRK

14. Page 48, subclause 5.2.2.7: Thsi subclause implies that EXPRESS identifiers shoudl be bold, but I coannot find where the document says this explicitly. I think it whould say so in 6.5.1. An example is the confusing case of "vertexs" in the last line of the paragraph. PRK